AGENDA ITEM NO.:  
WARD: 6

1. Case Number: P14-0026 (Conditional Use Permit) & P14-0027 (Design Review)

2. Project Title: McDonalds

3. Hearing Date: October 9, 2014

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

5. Contact Person: Kyler Smith, AICP, Associate Planner
Phone Number: (951) 826-5220

6. Project Location: 10952 Magnolia Avenue, situated on the southerly side of Magnolia Avenue, between Park Sierra Avenue and La Sierra Avenue.

7. Project Applicant/Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:

   Applicant
Scott Wilkenson, Area Construction Manager
McDonalds Corporation, LLC
3880 Kilroy Airport Way, Suite 200
Long Beach, CA 90806

   Architect
Andrew Rappe, Project Manager
3401 Centerlake Drive, Suite 330
Ontario, CA 91761

8. General Plan Designation: MU-U - Mixed Use Urban

9. Zoning: CR-X-10-SP – Commercial Retail and Building Setback (10 feet from Magnolia Avenue), and Specific Plan (Magnolia Avenue) Overlay Zones

10. Description of Project:

Proposal by McDonalds Corporation, LLC for consideration of a Conditional Use Permit to permit a drive through business (“McDonalds”), and for Design Review of the plot plan and building elevations related to the construction of an approximately 5,160 square foot fast food restaurant including an indoor play area, indoor &
outdoor eating areas, and an approximately 220 foot long “side-by-side” drive thru, located on a vacant site at 10952 Magnolia Avenue, situated on the southerly side of Magnolia Avenue, between Park Sierra Avenue and La Sierra Avenue, located adjacent to the existing “Walgreens”, in the CR-X-10-SP – Commercial Retail and Building Setback (10 feet from Magnolia Avenue), and Specific Plan (Magnolia Avenue) Overlay Zones, in Ward 6.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Site</strong></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>MU-U - Mixed Use Urban</td>
<td>CR-X-10-SP – Commercial Retail and Building Setback (10 feet from Magnolia Avenue), and Specific Plan (Magnolia Avenue) Overlay Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast</strong></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>MU-U - Mixed Use Urban</td>
<td>R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southeast</strong></td>
<td>Commercial, Vacant</td>
<td>MU-U - Mixed Use Urban</td>
<td>CR-SP – Commercial Retail and Specific Plan (Magnolia Avenue) Overlay Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest</strong></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>MU-U - Mixed Use Urban</td>
<td>CG-X-10-SP – Commercial General and Building Setback (10 feet from Magnolia Avenue), and Specific Plan (Magnolia Avenue) Overlay Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwest</strong></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>MU-V - Mixed Use Village</td>
<td>CR-SP – Commercial Retail and Specific Plan (Magnolia Avenue) Overlay Zones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

None

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

a. General Plan 2025  
b. GP 2025 FPEIR  
c. Traffic Impact Analysis  
d. Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan, prepared by Core States Group  
e. Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Inland Engineering Technologies, Inc.

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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GhG</td>
<td>Green House Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP 2025</td>
<td>General Plan 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Initial Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHMP</td>
<td>Local Hazard Mitigation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARB/MIP</td>
<td>March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJPA-JLUS</td>
<td>March Joint Powers Authority - Joint Land Use Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSHCP</td>
<td>Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVUSD</td>
<td>Moreno Valley Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCP</td>
<td>Natural Communities Conservation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEM</td>
<td>Office of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR</td>
<td>Office of Planning &amp; Research, State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIR</td>
<td>Program Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Public Works, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCALUC</td>
<td>Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCALUCP</td>
<td>Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCP</td>
<td>Regional Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCTC</td>
<td>Riverside County Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMC</td>
<td>Riverside Municipal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>Riverside Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPU</td>
<td>Riverside Public Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTIP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSD</td>
<td>Riverside Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>Southern California Association of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>State Clearinghouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKR-HCP</td>
<td>Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat - Habitat Conservation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>United States Geologic Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMWD</td>
<td>Western Municipal Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQMP</td>
<td>Water Quality Management Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
1. **AESTHETICS.**

Would the project:

<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>a.</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The City’s General Plan 2025 policies aim at balancing development interests with broader community preservation objectives. As this project complies and implements the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan standard which precludes drive-thru lanes & windows from fronting on Magnolia Avenue, impacts related to scenic vistas, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to scenic vistas are **less than significant impacts**.

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

The General Plan 2025 designates several roadways as Scenic Boulevards and Parkways in order to protect scenic resources and enhance the visual character of Riverside. The proposed project is located along Magnolia Avenue which is designated as a Scenic/Special Boulevard within the Circulation and Community Mobility Element of the General Plan 2025. Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan includes policies intended to minimize aesthetic impacts and impacts on visual resources, such as precluding drive-thru lanes & windows from fronting on Magnolia Avenue, and this project will comply with these policies. Based on this, impacts related to scenic resources are **less than significant**.

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

The proposed project is required to implement the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan standard which precludes drive-thru lanes & windows from fronting on Magnolia Avenue. The project is subject to Design Review consistent with established Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines. Due to all these factors, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on the visual character and quality of the area are **less than significant impacts**.

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, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan)*

The proposed project involves the construction of a 5,160 square foot fast food restaurant, which will involve the introduction of new lighting typically associated with commercial development. This lighting would be similar to that which exists in the surrounding area and would not be considered significant. Additionally, the site is not within the Mount Palomar Lighting Area. The impact is **less than significant**.
### 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 compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

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

2a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability & General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table)

The project is located in an urbanized area of the City in an existing commercial development. Additionally, the site is identified as urban/built out land and therefore does not support agricultural resources or operations. There are no agricultural resources or operations, including farmlands within proximity of the subject site. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on agricultural uses.

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

2b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-3 - Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Figure 5.2-4 – Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural Uses, and Title 19)

A review of Figure 5.2-2 – Williamson Act Preserves of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR reveals that the project site is not located within an area that is affected by a Williamson Act Preserve or under a Williamson Act Contract. Moreover, the project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not next to land zoned for agricultural use; therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

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

2c. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)

The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

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.

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>
<tr>
<td>2d. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)</td>
<td>The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland, therefore <strong>no impacts</strong> will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table, Title 19 – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones – RC Zone and RA-5 Zone and GIS Map – Forest Data)</td>
<td>The project is located in an urbanized area of the City in an existing commercial development. 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, <strong>no impacts</strong> will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively to conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or to the loss of forest land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. AIR QUALITY.

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<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>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Response: (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP))</td>
<td>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 <strong>less than significant</strong> impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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, URBEMIS 2007 Model or CalEEMod, EMFAC 2007 Model)</td>
<td>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 <strong>less than significant</strong> directly, indirectly and cumulatively to ambient air quality and will not contribute to an existing air quality violation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</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>

*Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, URBEMIS 2007 Model or CalEEMod 2007 Model, EMFAC 2007 Model*

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

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

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

**d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

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

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

3e. **Response:**

While the proposed use may potentially expose people to objectionable odors, industrial and commercial uses that could generate objectionable odors are subject to SCAQMD Rule 402 governing odor emissions. Through compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people and a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively will occur.

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.**

Would the project:

| a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|

4a. **Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and...*
**ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</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 site is located within an urban built-up area and is surrounded by existing development and 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, a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively will occur to federally endangered threatened, or rare species or their habitats.

**b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**  

| | | | | ☒ |

**4b. Response:**  
**Source:** General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools

The project site is located within an urban built-up area, contains existing development, and has a long history of severe disturbance such that the project would not have a substantial adverse effect, on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means. Therefore, a **less than significant impact** will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

**c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**  

| | | | | ☒ |

**4c. Response:**  
**Source:** City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS Quad Map Layer

The project site is located within an urban built-up area, contains existing development, and has a history of severe disturbance such that the project would not have a substantial adverse effect, on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means. Therefore, a **less than significant impact** will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

**d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**  

| | | | | ☒ |

**4d. Response:**  
**Source:** MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkage

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

**e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or**

| | | | | ☒ |
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinance?</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>

4e. Response: (Source: MSHCP, Title 16 Section 16.72.040 – Establishing the Western Riverside County MSHCP Mitigation Fee, Title 16 Section 16.40.040 – Establishing a Threatened and Endangered Species Fees, City of Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual)

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

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

4f. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Stephen’s 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 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?

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 located on a site where no historic resources exist as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, no impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively to historical resources are expected.

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?

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

The project is located on a site where no archeological resources exist as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, no impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively to historical resources are expected.

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

5c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3)
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

The project is located on a site where no paleontological resources exist as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, no impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively to historical resources are expected.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

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

The project is located on a site where no known human remains exist. Therefore, no impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively to historical resources are expected.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

Would the project:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

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

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

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

6ii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)

The San Jacinto Fault Zone located in the northeastern portion of the City, or the Elsinore Fault Zone, located in the southern portion of the City’s Sphere of Influence, have the potential to cause moderate to large earthquakes that would cause intense ground shaking. Because the proposed project complies with California Building Code regulations, impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

6iii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)

The project site is located in an area with high 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 are reduced to less than significant impact levels directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

iv. Landslides?

6iv. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan SWPPP)

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

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6b. Response:</strong> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, and SWPPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion and loss of topsoil could occur as a result of the project. State and Federal requirements call for the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) establishing erosion and sediment controls for construction activities. The project must also comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations. In addition, with the erosion control standards for which all development activity must comply (Title 18), the Grading Code (Title 17) also requires the implementation of measures designed to minimize soil erosion. Compliance with State and Federal requirements as well as with Titles 18 and 17 will ensure that soil erosion or loss of topsoil will be <strong>less than significant impact</strong> directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6c. Response:</strong> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Figure 5.6-1 - Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general topography of the subject site are Buchenau, Hanford, and Arlington. Compliance with the City’s existing codes and the policies contained in the General Plan 2025 help to ensure that impacts related to geologic conditions are reduced to <strong>less than significant impact</strong> level directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6d. Response:</strong> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Figure 5.6-5 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, and California Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansive soil is defined under California Building Code. The soil type of the subject site are Buchenau, Hanford, and Arlington (See Figure 5.64 – Soils of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR.) Compliance with the applicable provisions of the City’s Subdivision Code- Title 18 and the California Building Code with regard to soil hazards related to the expansive soils will be reduced to a <strong>less than significant impact</strong> level for this project directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6e. Response:</strong> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In that the proposed project will be served by a septic tank a percolation report, conducted by a registered hydrologist and geotechnical or soils engineer, is required that addresses the site’s suitability for septic systems and its impact to groundwater supplies. Approval of the County of Riverside Environmental Health Department and the State Water Quality Control Board is also required. The compliance of the project design with the percolation report recommendations will ensure that soils are capable of supporting the use of a septic system and therefore, impacts will be a <strong>less than significant impact</strong> directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</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>

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?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7a. **Response:**

Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG’s modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the RTP, the SCAQMD’s AQMP, RTIP, and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 “Typical Growth Scenario.” However, due to the size and scope of the proposed project, a Climate Change Analysis was commissioned by the applicant to determine if the project related impacts (both construction and operational) would produce GHG emissions that would have a significant direct, indirect or cumulative impact on the environment. Thus, a **less than significant impact** is expected directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

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

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7b. **Response:**

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

8. **HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.**

Would the project:

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

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


The proposed project does not involve the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material. 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?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


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
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>

c.  Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?   

| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

8c. Response: *(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety and Education Elements, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.7-D - CalARP RMP Facilities in the Project Area, Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D RUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-3 AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E AUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code)*

The proposed project does not involve any emission or handling of any hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing school. Therefore, the project will have no impact regarding emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

d.  Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

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

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

| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

The project site is not located within any airport land use plan area or compatibility zone. Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area directly, indirectly or 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?

| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

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

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

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

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

The project will be served by existing, fully improved streets. All streets have been designed to meet the Public Works and Fire Departments’ specifications. Any street closing will be of short duration so as not to interfere or impede with any foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
### 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>Emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, the project will have a <strong>less than significant impact</strong> directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an emergency response or evacuation plan.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

**8h. Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Hazard Areas, GIS Map Layer VHFSZ 2010, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002, 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 and/or Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Core States Group)*

The project site is currently developed with close to 100 percent of impervious surface, with the exception of landscaped areas. Upon construction of the buildings and parking lot for this project, the permeable area of the project site will increase slightly with additional landscaped area. A preliminary WQMP has been submitted and approved by the Public Works Department for this project. Furthermore, under the NPDES permit managed by the RWQCB, the project is not required to institute new water quality BMPs, as no new runoff will be generated from the project. Urban runoff is currently and will continue to be conveyed by local drainage facilities developed throughout the City to regional drainage facilities, and then ultimately to the receiving waters. To address potential water contaminants, the project is required to comply with applicable Federal, State, and local water quality regulations. 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, Table PF-3 – Western Municipal Water District Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), RPU Map of Water Supply Basins, RPU Urban Water Management Plan, WMWD Urban Water Management Plan)*

The proposed project is located within the Arlington Water Supply. 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.
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>

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

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

9d. Response: (Source: Preliminary grading plan)
Underground storm drains and streets are designed to accommodate the 10-year storm flow from curb to curb, while 100-year storms are accommodated within street right-of-ways. The runoff from the project in a developed condition has been studied and is required to be attenuated on-site, so although the drainage pattern will be altered the off-site discharge is the same as the undeveloped condition. Therefore, there will be less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively in the rate or amount of surface runoff that it will not result in flooding on- or off-site.

e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

9e. Response: (Source: Preliminary Grading Plan)
Within the scope of the project is the installation of storm water drainage system, specifically as described within the project description portion of this project. As the storm water drainage system will be installed concurrently with the construction of this project, the storm water drainage system will be adequately sized to accommodate the drainage created by this project. The project is expected to generate the following pollutants: sediment/turbidity, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen demanding substances, bacteria and viruses, oil & grease, and pesticides. These expected pollutants will be treated through the incorporation of the site design, source control and treatment control measures specified in the project specific WQMP. Therefore, as the expected pollutants will be mitigated through the project site design, source control, and treatment controls already integrated into the project design, the project will not create or contribute runoff water exceeding capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff and there will be a less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

9f. Response: (Source: Project Specific – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and Water Quality Management Plan)
The project is over one are in size and is required to have coverage under the State’s General Permit for Construction Activities (SWPPP). As stated in the Permit, during and after construction, best management practices (BMPs) will be implemented to reduce/eliminate adverse water quality impacts resulting from development. Furthermore, the City has ensured that the development does not cause adverse water quality impacts, pursuant to its Municipal Separate Storm System (MS4) permit through the project’s WQMP.

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

<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>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2025 Program FPEIR, indicates that project site is an in an area with 0.2% annual chance of flood hazards. The City Municipal Code, Title 16 Buildings & Construction, Chapter 16.18 Flood Hazard Area & Implementation of National Flood Insurance Program, Sec.16.18.050 requires new construction located within a 100-year flood zone to mitigate flood hazards by including onsite drainage, anchoring methods to prevent floating structures, elevating buildings above flood levels, and flood proofing, which requires the building to be inspected and certified by a professional engineer, surveyor or building inspector. Therefore, impacts of flood hazards to the proposed project will be **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

| 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 proposed project may affect or be impacted by a 100-year flood hazard area as depicted in Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas of the General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR and the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0715G Effective Date August 28, 2008). However, the City Municipal Code, Title 16 Buildings and Construction, Chapter 16.18 Flood Hazard Area & Implementation of national Flood Insurance Program, Sec.16.18.050 requires new construction located within a 100-year flood zone to mitigate flood hazards by including onsite drainage, anchoring methods to prevent floating structures, elevating buildings above flood levels, and flood proofing, which requires the building to be inspected and certified by a professional engineer, surveyor or building inspector. Therefore, the potential to place a structure within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows will be **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

| i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

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

The project site is located within an area with a 0.2% chance of annual flood risk 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) due to the location of Mockingbird Canyon and Harrison Dams as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas. The project is located within the inundation area of Mockingbird Canyon and Harrison Dams, and may be affected in the event of a dam failure. In the event of a dam failure, first flow waters are expected to reach the site in 48 - 107 minutes. Therefore, the project will place a structure within an area with 0.2% annual chance of flood hazards and 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. Therefore, the potential to place a structure within an area that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death as a result of the failure of a dam will be **less than significant**
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?

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

The proposed project has been designed to be consistent with the fit into the pattern of development of the surrounding area providing adequate access, circulation and connectivity consistent with the General Plan 2025, and in compliance with the requirements of the Zoning and Subdivision Codes. Therefore, the project impacts related to the community are **less than significant**.

b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

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

Although the project is located within the boundaries of the MSHCP, it has been designed to be consistent with these plans. As well, the project is consistent with the Magnolia Avenues Specific Plan and the General Plan 2025 and it is not a project of Statewide, Regional or Areawide Significance. Any variances related to this project can be justified based on the findings contained in the case record. Pursuant to the Riverside Municipal Code. As such, this project will have a **less than significant impact** on any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

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

The project site is located on a previously 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.

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 or grading activity. No mineral resources have been identified on the project site and there is no historical use of the site or surrounding area for mineral extraction purposes. The project site is not, nor is it adjacent to, a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the General Plan 2025, specific plan or other land use plan. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** on mineral resources directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

### 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:

<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><strong>a.</strong> 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b.</strong> Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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)

No significant increases in noise levels on adjacent uses are anticipated, especially in light of the fact that the existing vehicular traffic on Magnolia Avenue is a larger contributor to the existing noise environment. Site operations will be required to be conducted in compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance (Title 7 of the Municipal Code). Compliance with the Noise Ordinance will insure that any increased noise level should not be more than what was previously considered and approved as part of the General Plan and should not be detrimental to any surrounding land uses. As the project is constructed, a temporary increase in noise levels due to construction/grading activity may occur. Potential noise impacts should be limited by compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance (Title 7), which limits construction noise that would disturb a residential neighborhood to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. weekdays, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays. No construction noise is permitted on Sundays or federal holidays.

<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><strong>b.</strong> Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12b. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, FPEIR Table 5.11-G – Vibration Source Levels For Construction Equipment, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)

A temporary increase in noise and vibration levels may be noticed during project construction; however, these activities will be subject to compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance and a less than significant short-term impact will occur. Also, with the development and use for up to five single family residences no long-term vibration impacts will occur.

<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><strong>c.</strong> A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</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>

- **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 noise mentioned on Responses 12a and 12b is not likely to result in a substantial permanent increase in noise levels, based on the nature of the proposed project. The project will be required to comply with the City’s Noise Code (Title 7 of the Riverside Municipal Code) at all times. Therefore, impacts related to the exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of standards established is considered **less than significant**.

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

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

As the project is constructed, a temporary increase in noise levels due to construction/grading activity may occur. Potential noise impacts should be limited by compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance (Title 7), which limits construction noise that would disturb a residential neighborhood to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. weekdays, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays. No construction noise is permitted on Sundays or federal holidays.

| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☒ |

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

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport of public use airport and as such will have **no impact** on people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☒ |

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

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

**13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.**

Would the project:

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

**13a. Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 Table LU-3 – Land Use Designations, FPEIR Table 5.12-A – SCAG Population and Households Forecast, Table 5.12-B – General Plan Population and Employment Projections – 2025, Table 5.12-C – 2025 General Plan and SCAG Comparisons, Table 5.12-D - General Plan Housing Projections 2025, Capital Improvement Program and SCAG’s RCP and RTP)*
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 involves a commercial business that may directly induce population growth, and may involve additional infrastructure that could indirectly induce population growth. However, the project is consistent with the land use designation established under the General Plan 2025 Program and the additional infrastructure is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Program. The General Plan 2025 Final PEIR determined that Citywide, future development anticipated under the General Plan 2025 Typical scenario would not have significant population growth impacts. Because the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical growth scenario and population growth impacts were previously evaluated in the GP 2025 FPEIR the project does not result in new impacts beyond those previously evaluated in the GP 2025 FPEIR; therefore, the impacts will be less than significant both directly and indirectly.

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

13b. Response: *(Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)*

The project will not displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the project site is proposed on a previously improved site that has no existing housing that will be removed or affected by the proposed project. Therefore, there will be no impact on existing housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

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

13c. Response: *(Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)*

The project will not displace any people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the project site is proposed a previously improved site that has no existing housing or residents that will be removed or affected by the proposed project. Therefore, this project will have no impact on people, necessitating the need for replacement housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES.

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a. Fire protection?

14a. Response: *(Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1)*

Adequate fire facilities and services are provided by the Riverside Fire Department to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Fire Department practices, there will be no impacts on the demand for additional fire facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

b. Police protection?

14b. Response: *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers)*

Adequate police facilities and services are provided by the Riverside Police Department to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Police Department practices, there will be no impact on the demand for additional police facilities of services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

c. Schools?

14c. Response: *(Source: FPEIR Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D – RUSD, Figure 5.13-3 – AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E – AUSD, Table 5.13-G – Student Generation for RUSD and AUSD By Education*
### ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level, and Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries</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>

d. Parks? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

The project is 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.

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

e. 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)*

Adequate public facilities and service such as libraries and communities centers and are provided to serve this project. Therefore, this project will not result in the intensification of land use and there will be **no impact** on the demand for additional public facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

### 15. RECREATION.

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

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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

The project is consistent with the adopted General Plan 2025 and will pay applicable Park Development Impact Fees to the City of Riverside Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department; therefore this project will have a **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

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

The 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:

| a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**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, and Project Specific Traffic Impact Analysis)

Roadway capacity is adequate to accommodate the projected traffic volumes of the proposed project. As determined by the City Traffic Engineer and a Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the proposed project the proposed project will operate better than the required LOS D, and will require minimal off-site improvements as conditions of approval, including the following conditions of approval:

- Furnish and install Polara Accessible Pedestrian Signal (APS) Systems at all crossings for signalized project intersections 1, 2, and 4 (La Sierra Avenue & Magnolia Avenue, Skofstad Street & Magnolia Avenue, and Park Sierra Drive & Magnolia Avenue).
- APS Systems will provide additional safety benefits for those intending to travel to the McDonald’s on foot, and potentially reduce vehicle trips & added delay by encouraging more users to walk.

Therefore, the increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system is less than significant directly, indirectly and 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? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

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

Roadway capacity is adequate to accommodate the projected traffic volumes of the proposed project. As determined by the City Traffic Engineer and a Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the proposed project the proposed project will operate better than the required LOS D. In addition, the project is consistent with the Riverside County’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) and its Transportation Demand Management/Air Quality components. Therefore, increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system is **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an</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>☐</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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The project will not change air traffic patterns, increase air traffic levels or change the location of air traffic patterns. It is not located within an airport influence area. 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 Plans, Lane Striping and Signing Plans)*

The project will not change air traffic patterns, increase air traffic levels or change the location of air traffic patterns. It is not located within an airport influence area. As such, this project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively on air traffic patterns.

The proposed project is compatible with adjacent existing uses. As well, it has been designed so as not to cause any incompatible use or additional or any hazards to the surrounding area or general public. As determined by the City Traffic Engineer and a Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the proposed project the proposed project will operate better than the required LOS D, and will require minimal off-site improvements as conditions of approval, including the following conditions of approval:

- Furnish and install Polara Accessible Pedestrian Signal (APS) Systems at all crossings for signalized project intersections 1, 2, and 4 (La Sierra Avenue & Magnolia Avenue, Skofstad Street & Magnolia Avenue, and Park Sierra Drive & Magnolia Avenue).

- APS Systems will provide additional safety benefits for those intending to travel to the McDonald’s on foot, and potentially reduce vehicle trips & added delay by encouraging more users to walk.

With these conditions, this project will have a **less than significant impact** on increasing hazards through design or incompatible uses either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

| ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

16e. **Response:** *(Source: California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, Municipal Code, and Fire Code)*

The project has been developed in compliance with Title 18, Section 18.210.030 and the City’s Fire Code Section 503 (California Fire Code 2007); therefore, there will be **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to emergency access.

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

| ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |


The proposed project as designed is not in conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks). As determined by the City Traffic Engineer and a Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the proposed project the proposed project will operate better than the required LOS D, and will require minimal off-site improvements as conditions of approval, including the following conditions of approval:

- Furnish and install Polara Accessible Pedestrian Signal (APS) Systems at all crossings for signalized project intersections 1, 2, and 4 (La Sierra Avenue & Magnolia Avenue, Skofstad Street & Magnolia Avenue, and Park Sierra Drive & Magnolia Avenue).

- APS Systems will provide additional safety benefits for those intending to travel to the McDonald’s on foot, and potentially reduce vehicle trips & added delay by encouraging more users to walk.
<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>Therefore, the proposed project impacts related to adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation are <strong>less than significant</strong> directly, indirectly and cumulatively as conditioned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES.
Would the project:

| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? |   |   | ☒ |   |

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

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

| b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |   |   |   | ☒ |

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

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

| c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |   |   | ☒ |   |

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

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

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

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

<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>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

<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>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**17e. Response:** *(Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 – Sewer Service Areas, Figure 5.16-6 –Sewer Infrastructure, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Table 5.16-L - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Area Served by WMWD, and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)*

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

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

<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>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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?

<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>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.
**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>

### 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?

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [x]
- [ ]

#### 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)

Potential impacts related to habitat of fish or wildlife species were discussed in the Biological Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were all found to be **less than significant**. Additionally, potential impacts to cultural, archaeological and paleontological resources related to major periods of California and the City of Riverside’s history or prehistory were discussed in the Cultural Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were found to be **less than significant**.

#### b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [x]
- [ ]

#### 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?

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [x]
- [ ]

#### 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**.

---