

Section 2 – Introduction

2.1 Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) is to evaluate and disclose potential environmental impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed Sycamore Canyon Business Park Buildings 1 and 2 (Sycamore V/VII, Hillwood/Magnon) Project located in the Sycamore Canyon/Canyon Springs neighborhood at the western terminus of Dan Kipper Drive, and west of the existing/proposed Lance Drive in the Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan, along with its associated street and utility improvements (hereinafter referred to as the Project), as further described in Section 3 of this DEIR.

2.2 Authorization

This DEIR has been prepared by the City of Riverside (City) as “Lead Agency” in accordance with the Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (State *CEQA Guidelines*), (Sections 15000–15387 of the California Code of Regulations), and the City’s *CEQA Guidelines*. The proposed Project considered in this DEIR is a “project,” as defined by Section 15378 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, which state that an EIR must be prepared for any project that may have a significant impact on the environment. The City, as Lead Agency, has determined that the Project may have a significant adverse impact on the environment; therefore, preparation of an EIR was required.

2.3 Lead and Responsible Agencies

CEQA defines a “Lead Agency” as the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have a significant effect upon the environment. Other agencies, e.g., Western Municipal Water District (WMWD), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), which also have some authority or responsibility to issue permits for project implementation, are designated as “responsible agencies.” Both the Lead Agency and responsible agencies must consider the information contained in the EIR prior to acting upon or approving a project. The City is the Lead Agency for the Project. The City’s address is:

City of Riverside
Community & Economic Development Department
Planning Division
3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Riverside, California 92522
Contact: Ms. Patricia Brenes, Principal Planner

Responsible agencies for the Project include:

- **Regional Water Quality Control Board:** For issuance of a Notice of Intent prior to construction operations related to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Permit, issuance of a water quality certification pursuant to

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act in connection with issuance of a Section 404 Clean Water Act permit.

- **California Department of Fish and Wildlife:** Issuance of agreements under Section 1601-1602 of the Fish and Game Code related to streambed alterations.
- **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:** Issuance of Section 404 permits under the Clean Water Act.
- **Western Municipal Water District:** Approval and construction of water improvements.

2.4 Project Applicant

The Project Applicant is:

Hillwood Enterprises, L.P.
901 Via Piemonte, Suite 175
Ontario, CA 91764
Contact: Ned Sciortino
and
The Magnon Companies
815 Marlborough Avenue, Suite 200
Riverside, CA 92507
Contact: Dave Stapley

2.5 Compliance with CEQA

The basic purposes of CEQA are to:

1. inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities;
2. identify the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced;
3. prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible; and
4. disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved. (State *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15002)

2.5.1 Environmental Procedures

The EIR process typically consists of three parts—the Notice of Preparation (NOP), DEIR, and Final EIR. Pursuant to Section 15060(d) of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, the City initiated the environmental process without preparation of an initial study and proceeded directly to preparation of the NOP. The NOP was distributed to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and other interested parties, on August 18, 2015. Pursuant to Section 15082 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, recipients of the NOP were requested to provide responses within 30

days after their receipt of the NOP. Because the Project is considered to be of statewide, regional, or area wide significance, per Section 15206(b) (2)(E) of the State *CEQA Guidelines* a scoping meeting was held on August 26, 2015 at 6465 Sycamore Canyon Boulevard, Riverside, CA.

Agencies and interested parties that submitted written comments in response to the NOP are identified in **Table 2-A – Summary of Written Comments Received in Response to the Notice of Preparation** and copies of the letters received are included in Appendix A.2 of this DEIR.

**Table 2-A – Summary of Written Comments Received
in Response to the Notice of Preparation**

Commenting Party (Date of Letter/email)	Summary of Comment	Addressed in Section(s) of the DEIR^a
Alec Gerry (Aug 19, 2015)	The commenter's email is addressed to neighbors north of the Project site and expresses concern that the community was not consulted by the developer before scheduling the scoping meeting and comment period on the NOP. Noise and the need for a buffer between large industrial warehouses and residential uses are the only two environmental issues identified in this email.	Section 5.12 – Noise Section 5.10 – Land Use and Planning
Maureen Clemens (Aug 24, 2015)	This comment letter raises the question as to why the Developer did not contact the community prior to preparation and distribution of the NOP.	No environmental issues are identified in this comment letter. The NOP and scoping meeting notification were provided in accordance with the CEQA Statute and Guidelines.
California Department of Transportation, District 8 (Aug 24, 2015)	Caltrans recommends preparation of a traffic impact study, in accordance with their "Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies" to determine impacts to the State Highway System (SHS) and provides specific recommendations regarding the age of data, geographic area to be examined, traffic scenarios to be evaluated, and assumptions for the analysis. Caltrans also requested a hard copy of all traffic impact analysis	Section 5.16 – Transportation /Traffic The traffic impact analysis is included in Appendix J.

Commenting Party (Date of Letter/email)	Summary of Comment	Addressed in Section(s) of the DEIR^a
	documents and an electronic Synchro analysis file.	
Western Municipal Water District (WMWD) (Aug 27, 2015) (letter mistakenly labeled Aug 27, 2014)	WMWD identifies studies to be provided by the Developer (potable water and recycled water demands), requests preliminary plans prior to formal submittal of Water and Recycled Water Improvement Plans, requests submittal of grading plans prior to the City issuing a grading permit. WMWD states a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) is required and indicates non-potable or recycled water shall be used for soil moisture conditioning and dust control.	Section 5.9 – Hydrology/Water Quality The WSA is included as Appendix H.
Sycamore Highlands Action Group (SHAG) (Aug 26, 2015) sent directly to the City Manager in regard to the NOP	SHAG identified the siting of the “mega-warehouse” in proximity to residential uses as inappropriate given the 2005 WRCOG and AQMD Good Neighbor Guidelines and the City’s own Good Neighbor Policy from 2008.	Section 5.10 – Land Use and Planning Appendix M Also, see comments addressed below.
Sycamore Highlands Action Group (SHAG) (Sept 15, 2015)	SHAG identified concerns with regard to consistency with Good Neighbor Guidelines, air emissions, light pollution, traffic, noise, nuisance, drainage, consistency with Smart Growth principles. A copy of this letter is included in Appendix A.	Section 5.1 – Aesthetics. Section 5.3 – Air Quality Section 5.4 – Biological Resources. Section 5.7 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Section 5.8 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials Section 5.9 – Hydrology and Water Quality Section 5.10 – Land Use and Planning. Section 5.12 – Noise Section 5.13 – Population and Housing Section 5.16 – Transportation/Traffic Appendix M The air quality and greenhouse gas technical

Commenting Party (Date of Letter/email)	Summary of Comment	Addressed in Section(s) of the DEIR^a
		analyses are included as Appendices B and F, respectively.
Raj Daniel (Sept 15, 2015)	Commenter notes that residences north of the project site will be affected because of amendment to the general plan, but residences east of the project site are already facing the Business Park. Commenter suggests that the city can accommodate to give some relief to these residents and still move forward with the project.	Section 5.10 – Land Use and Planning
Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) (Sept 15, 2015)	ALUC notes that the previous determination that the City's 2025 General Plan was consistent with the 1984 Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan is no longer applicable. In the interim, all discretionary projects within the March AIA must be officially submitted to ALUC for determination as to consistency. Thus, ALUC recommends that the applicant submit this Project for review by ALUC. Given that the site is partially located within Compatibility Zone C1, review at an official ALUC hearing will be required.	Section 5.8 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) (Sept 16, 2015)	SCAG describes how the goals included in SCAG's 2012 RTP/SCS can be used as guidance for considering the proposed project within the context of regional goals and policies. In particular, SCAG suggests that RTP/SCS goals G1-G9 may be relevant. SCAG also describes strategies and mitigation to be used as guidance and includes the applicable regional growth forecasts for the region and City of Riverside.	Section 6 – Other CEQA Topics
Ralphs Grocery Company (Sept 16, 2015)	Ralphs requests that the EIR take into account the potential effects the Project would have on Hydrology and Water Quality and that it evaluate whether the Project would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, or	Section 5.9 – Hydrology and Water Quality

Commenting Party (Date of Letter/email)	Summary of Comment	Addressed in Section(s) of the DEIR^a
	create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, or would expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding or inundation by mudflow. Ralphs cites a past example when dam, drainage, and retention facilities on the proposed Project location failed, causing a deluge of water and debris onto Ralphs Property. Ralphs also expresses disappointment in not receiving the NOP with sufficient time to meaningfully participate in discussions, as the document was sent to the wrong location and was missing pages. The mailing list has been updated to reflect the address to John DeFrance, Esq. as requested in the letter.	
City of Moreno Valley (Sept 16, 2015)	The City of Moreno Valley Transportation Engineering Division describes the project components and location and the anticipated traffic generation by the project per the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. They note that the Project EIR being prepared should further address impacts caused by the Project to the existing traffic circulation and air quality and propose appropriate mitigation measures. Transportation Engineering requests that a completed copy of the EIR and its Transportation/Traffic and Air Quality elements be provided for further review.	Section 5.16 – Transportation/Traffic
Friends of Riverside's Hills (Sept 16, 2015)	The Friends of Riverside's Hills comments that the following issues should be considered pursuant to City policy: 1. Conformance with the MSHCP "Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface," due to Project proximity to the Sycamore Canyon core area (City Policy OS-5.2);	Section 5.3 – Air Quality Section 5.4 – Biological Resources Section 5.10 – Land Use and Planning Section 7 – Energy Conservation Section 8 – Alternatives

Commenting Party (Date of Letter/email)	Summary of Comment	Addressed in Section(s) of the DEIR^a
	2. Participation in the Stephen's Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan (City Policy OS-5.3); 3. Mitigation and environmental impacts due to construction over a blue-line stream (City Policy OS-2.2); 4. Necessity of siting such a pollution-producing development in this location, next to a residential neighborhood (City Policy LU-8.2, City Policy N-1.8, City Policy AQ-1.1 and 1.3); 5. Use of energy of the project, especially the possibility for installation of roof-top solar cells (City Policy AQ-8.6); 6. A range of well thought out alternative projects for the site beyond the usual dead-on-arrival "no project." The Friends of Riverside's Hills suggest less polluting alternatives such as office building, residential or incorporation of open space and the blue line stream into Project design.	to the Proposed Project
Laborers International Union of North America, Local Union 1184 (LiUNA) (Sept 29, 2015)	These comments were received from Lozeau Drury LLP on behalf of LiUNA. Lozeau Drury requests notification of any public hearing in connection with the Project, any and all notices prepared for the Project pursuant to CEQA, and a copy of all Planning Commission and City Council meeting and/or hearing agendas.	No environmental issues are identified in this comment letter. Loreau Drury, LLP will be added to the Project's distribution list.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (Oct 8, 2015)	USFWS wants to ensure that the proponent/consultants will prepare a MSHCP Consistency Analysis, and if necessary, a Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation. USFWS notes that aerial imagery shows	Section 5.4 – Biological Resources

Commenting Party (Date of Letter/email)	Summary of Comment	Addressed in Section(s) of the DEIR ^a
	the presence of a stream which appears to flow north to south through the center of the project until it reaches a group of riparian trees at the edge of the existing business park development. USFWS comments that the consultants need to determine if water flows beyond that point and what its ultimate destination is. If it is determined that the stream's waters ultimately flow into one or more MSHCP water bodies, then the City would need to further implement the MSHCP's Riparian/Riverine Policy in regards to the Project.	
Southern California Gas Company (Oct 21, 2015)	The Southern California Gas Company Transmission Department does not operate facilities within the proposed improvement. They recommend contacting the Southeast Distribution Region to ensure that there is no conflict with the local distribution's pipeline system.	Section 5.17 – Utilities and Service Systems

Notes:

^a Comments may also be addressed in other sections of the DEIR.

Oral comments received at the scoping meeting are summarized in **Table 2-B – Summary of Oral Comments Received at the August 26, 2015, Scoping Meeting**. It should be noted that the majority of these oral comments are also reiterated in SHAG's comment letter discussed in **Table 2-A**, above. The sign-in sheet and notes from the Scoping meeting are included in Appendix A.3.

**Table 2-B – Summary of Oral Comments Received
at the August 26, 2015, Scoping Meeting**

Topic	Summary of Comment	Location in DEIR in which Comment is Addressed ^a
Project Description	- Proposed 60-foot setback from Building 2 from northern property line is too close. - Will structures be used 24/7? - Consistency with City of Riverside <i>Good Neighbor Guidelines for Siting</i>	Section 5.3 – Air Quality and Section 5.10 – Land Use and Planning.

Topic	Summary of Comment	Location in DEIR in which Comment is Addressed ^a
	<i>New and/or Modified Warehouse Distribution Facilities</i> , specifically in regards to buffer zones (also listed under Air Quality and Land Use and Planning)	
Aesthetics	• Light impacts to off-site residential uses – will it spillover into the residential properties to the north at the lower elevation?	Section 5.1 – Aesthetics.
Air Quality	• Health impacts (e.g., respiratory illnesses, cancer, leukemia) • Consistency with City of Riverside <i>Good Neighbor Guidelines for Siting New and/or Modified Warehouse Distribution Facilities</i>, specifically in regards to buffer zones (also listed under Project Description and Land Use and Planning) • Consideration of the April 2005 document <i>Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective</i> by the California Air Resources Board • Potential use of transport refrigeration units (TRUs) • Consideration of the elevation difference of off-site residential uses in the air quality impact modeling.	Section 5.3 – Air Quality
Biological Resources	• Impacts to Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park (also listed under Recreation) • Impacts on animals in the area – coyotes are already entering residential area and attacking domestic animals • Impacts on federal- and state-listed species • Impacts on arroyos/water features	Section 5.4 – Biological Resources. Section 5.9 – Hydrology and Water Quality. The technical studies for biological resources are included in Appendix B. Technical studies regarding drainage are included in Appendix H.

Topic	Summary of Comment	Location in DEIR in which Comment is Addressed ^a
Cultural Resources	Impacts to cultural resources, in general.	Section 5.5 – Cultural Resources and Appendices D.1 and D.2 Cultural Resources Assessment and Paleontological Resource Assessment
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Account for the chemical reactions of NO and O₃ resulting in NO₂	Section 5.7 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	What if future tenants wants to store and transport hazardous materials and chemicals at site	Section 5.8 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Hydrology and Water Quality	Impacts from runoff and drainage during construction and operation	Section 5.9 – Hydrology and Water Quality
Land Use and Planning	- Consistency with <i>City of Riverside Good Neighbor Guidelines for Siting New and/or Modified Warehouse Distribution Facilities</i>, specifically in regards to buffer zones (also listed under Air Quality and Project Description) - Has Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan been amended to account for residential uses to the north or the <i>Good Neighbor Guidelines</i> - Describe the site plan in relationship to off-site residential uses - Project is proposing warehouse space much closer to Sycamore Highlands residential area than the preceding projects	Section 5.3 – Air Quality and Section 5.10 – Land Use and Planning.
Noise	- Analyze operational noise from 24/7 use - Noise analysis should consider that existing noise levels are already disruptive and an annoyance, and has led to residences complaining to the city - Baseline condition should be based on 2001 noise levels - Typical sound wall mitigation will not be adequate for residential uses at	Section 5.12 – Noise

Topic	Summary of Comment	Location in DEIR in which Comment is Addressed ^a
	higher elevation to northwest corner of site • Existing noise is already a problem because of Interstate 215, March Air Reserve Base, and trucks at Sycamore Canyon Business Park – how much louder does the area need to be before city determines it is too loud • What if the existing baseline noise level is already exceeding standards • Nighttime noise impact on sleeping, specifically negative impacts on kids trying to sleep and result on individuals' productivity at work • Operational noise impacts from trucks' back-up alert beeper • Noise analysis should consider the grade differences and effects of the surrounding topography on noise travel • Consider noise from HVAC and that it may be at same level of residential uses • Consider the noise from the use of generators or back-up generators for Transport Refrigeration Unit (TRUs) • Ambient noise reading should consider noise levels from public street right-of-way in residential area north of project site • If noise modeling and methodology is the same as that used for Big 5 warehouse, how can it be reliable since that warehouse use results in disruptive noise levels as perceived by residents	
Population and Housing	• Impact on the existing Sycamore Highlands neighborhood • Consider socioeconomic status of existing residential community	Section 5.10 – Land Use and Planning and Section 5.13 – Population and Housing

Topic	Summary of Comment	Location in DEIR in which Comment is Addressed ^a
Public Services	• Project will increase crime in area	Section 5.14 – Public Services
Recreation	• Impacts to Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park (also listed under Biological Resources)	Section 5.15 – Recreation
Transportation/Traffic	• Analysis should take into consideration that if the amendment to the Circulation Plan for the Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan is not approved, the site will only have one ingress/egress point from Lance Drive north of Sierra Ridge Road (<i>implication is that Lance Drive would not be extended to connect with Dan Kipper Drive, thus providing an additional ingress/egress near Building 2</i>). • What freeways will be analyzed • Consider accident rates at freeway on- and off-ramps	Section 5.16 – Transportation/Traffic and Appendix J – Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA)
Cumulative impacts	• Cumulative impact on health, specifically in conjunctions with World Logistics Center in Moreno Valley • What will be the cumulative warehouse space and amount of bays/dock doors within the Sycamore Canyon Business Park with the proposed project and how will that be included into cumulative impacts such as noise	Section 6 – Other CEQA Topics
Alternatives to the Proposed Project	• What are the alternatives to the proposed project	Section 8 – Alternatives to the Proposed Project
Miscellaneous	• Emphasis that project is “proposed,” and not a done deal • Tentative timeline for the Project from now to Project approval • Has City ever not approved a project in the Sycamore Canyon Business Park • Property value depreciation in Sycamore Highlands	These comments do not pertain to an environmental impact issue and are not discussed in this EIR; however, comments have been noted

Topic	Summary of Comment	Location in DEIR in which Comment is Addressed ^a
	• How can impacts be analyzed if tenants are unknown • Why is the city even considering this project and how did it even get this far along • Why this site and not another location within the business park • Will developer meet with the neighborhood • Are all project site parcels owned by the developer • To whom should complaints and further comments be directed • Were notifications only sent to 18 homes • Purpose of tonight's meeting unclear from the NOP, thought it was a meeting with the developer • Extend the project notification to 1,000-foot radius based on the <i>Good Neighbor Guidelines</i>	

Notes:

^a Comments may also be addressed in other sections of the DEIR.

Copies of the NOP, the NOP distribution list, the sign-in sheet and notes from the scoping meeting, and copies of written comments received by the City in response to the NOP are included in Appendix A.

An EIR is an informational document intended to inform decision makers and the general public of potentially significant environmental impacts of a project. An EIR also identifies possible ways to minimize these potentially significant impacts (referred to as mitigation) and describes alternatives to a project that may also reduce its significant impacts. Having the authority to take action on the proposed Project, the City Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in this EIR in their evaluations of the proposal. The findings and conclusions presented in the EIR regarding environmental impacts do not control the City's discretion to approve, deny, or modify the Project, but instead are presented as information to aid the decision-making process.

As set forth in Section 15021 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, as Lead Agency, the City has the duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. Furthermore, Section

15021(d) of the State *CEQA Guidelines* states that, “CEQA recognizes that in determining whether and how a project should be approved, a public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors, and in particular the goal of providing a decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian.” Other public agencies (i.e., Responsible and Trustee Agencies) that may use this DEIR in their decision-making or permit processes will consider the information in this DEIR along with other information that may be presented during the CEQA process. In accordance with CEQA, the public agencies will be required to make findings for each environmental impact of the proposed Project that cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance. If the Lead Agency determines that the benefits of the proposed Project outweigh unmitigated significant environmental effects, the Lead Agency will be required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations stating the reasons supporting its action notwithstanding the proposed project’s significant environmental effects.

2.5.2 Potentially Significant Environmental Effects

CEQA requires consideration and discussion of significant environmental effects. Sections 15126–15126.2 of the State *CEQA Guidelines* state that, “All phases of a project must be considered when evaluating its impact on the environment: planning, acquisition, development, and operation [...] an EIR shall identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the proposed project.” CEQA provides that a DEIR shall focus on all potentially significant effects created by the project onto the environment, discussing the effects with emphasis in proportion to their severity and probability of occurrence. Effects dismissed in an Initial Study as insignificant and unlikely to occur need not be discussed further in the DEIR unless information inconsistent with the finding in the Initial Study is subsequently received. However, no Initial Study was prepared for this Project, and as such, no effects were determined to be less than significant prior to preparation of the DEIR.

Section 5 of the DEIR addresses each environmental effect that was determined to be potentially significant during preparation of the Project’s NOP (Appendix A). Each effect is organized into an issue area; those that will be analyzed (and the section of the DEIR in which the analysis is contained) are listed below:

- Aesthetics (Section 5.1)
- Agriculture & Forestry Resources (Section 5.2)
- Air Quality (Section 5.3)
- Biological Resources (Section 5.4)
- Cultural Resources (Section 5.5)
- Geology & Soils (Section 5.6)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Section 5.7)
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials (Section 5.8)
- Hydrology & Water Quality (Section 5.9)
- Land Use & Planning (Section 5.10)

- Mineral Resources (Section 5.11)
- Noise (Section 5.12)
- Population/Housing (Section 5.13)
- Public Services (Section 5.14)
- Recreation (Section 5.15)
- Transportation/Traffic (Section 5.16)
- Utilities & Service Systems (Section 5.17)

2.5.3 Format

This DEIR has been organized in several sections as follows:

Table of Contents to assist readers in locating the analysis of different subjects and issues as required by Section 15122 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*. A list of acronyms used in the DEIR is included in the table of contents.

Section 1 – Executive Summary covers the summary requirements of CEQA as required by Section 15123 of the State *CEQA Guidelines* and includes: the proposed project location, a brief project description, a matrix containing a summary of environmental impacts and mitigation measures, project objectives, approvals related to the proposed project, areas of controversy, and a brief description of the project alternatives.

Section 2 – Introduction describes the scope and purpose of the DEIR, identifies the project applicant and Lead Agency, provides a brief summary of the CEQA process to date, summarizes and identifies the documents incorporated by reference in the DEIR, identifies the parties that provided written comments in response to the NOP, summarizes the comments provided, and identifies the location in the DEIR in which the comments are addressed.

Section 3 – Project Description contains the information required by Section 15124 of the State *CEQA Guidelines* including: a detailed description of the proposed project, the project objectives, a general description of the project’s environmental setting, the approvals needed to implement the project, and a list of agencies expected to use the DEIR.

Section 4 – Environmental Effects Found Not to be Significant and Notice of Preparation Comment Letters identifies those environmental effects found not to be significant during preparation of the EIR.

Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis satisfies the requirements of Sections 15125, 15126, 15126.2, and 15126.4 of the State *CEQA Guidelines* by including an analysis of each environmental issue area determined to have potentially significant impacts during preparation of the NOP or as a result of comments received in response to the NOP. For each issue area analyzed, this section includes a discussion of the setting to which each issue area is analyzed against, defines the related regulations affecting the proposed project, identifies the thresholds used to determine significance, describes any project design features that would reduce

impacts, analyzes the proposed project's impacts, provides a description of the mitigation measures used to reduce or lessen potential impacts, and discusses the project's impacts after mitigation.

Section 6 – Other CEQA Topics includes the project's cumulative impact analysis, unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project, and growth inducing impact discussion.

Section 7 – Energy Conservation addresses Energy Conservation per Appendix F of the State *CEQA Guidelines*.

Section 8 – Alternatives to the Proposed Project satisfies the requirements of Section 15126.6 of the State *CEQA Guidelines* by identifying and discussing the no project alternative in addition to alternatives to the proposed project that lessen the severity of significant impacts and identifying the environmentally superior alternative.

Section 9 – References includes a listing of all reference materials, the organizations and persons contacted in preparing the DEIR, and a list of preparers as required by Section 15129 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*.

2.6 Documents Incorporated by Reference

Section 15150 of the State *CEQA Guidelines* permits and encourages an environmental document to incorporate, by reference, other documents that provide relevant data. The documents summarized below are incorporated by reference, and the pertinent material is summarized throughout this DEIR, where that information is relevant to the analysis of potential impacts of the Project. All documents incorporated by reference are available for review at, or can be obtained through, the City of Riverside Planning Division of the Community & Economic Development Department. Technical studies cited below were specifically developed in conjunction with the Project. Where noted as appendices, the reports are included in their entirety in the CD-ROM version of the DEIR, and are also included in the CD-ROM attached to the front cover of hard copy versions of the DEIR.

2.6.1 City of Riverside General Plan 2025 Final Program Environmental Impact Report

The *City of Riverside General Plan 2025 Final Program Environmental Impact Report* (GP 2025 FPEIR) was certified in 2007. The GP 2025 FPEIR provided a first tier analysis of the potential environmental effects of the adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan, adoption and implementation of the comprehensive update of the Zoning Code and Subdivision Code, an amendment to the Noise Code, and adoption and implementation of the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan as well as the adoption and implementation of the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines. The GP 2025 FPEIR contains information regarding the environmental setting within the City and is available online at <http://www.riversideca.gov/planning/gp2025program/>.

2.6.2 City of Riverside General Plan 2025

The *City of Riverside General Plan 2025* (GP 2025) was adopted in 2007. The GP 2025 is a long-range plan designed to control and regulate growth in the City and to maintain the quality of the human and natural environment. The GP 2025 is the City's planning "constitution," or a blueprint for development, and is the single-most important policy document in guiding land use and development decisions within the City (GP 2025 FPEIR, p. 2-5). To that end, the GP 2025 contains goals and policies that serve as the planning framework for the City in addition to providing direction for City operations and programs, and serves as a guide to public and private decision making. The GP 2025 includes the following elements: Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation and Community Mobility, Housing, Arts and Culture, Education, Public Safety, Noise, Open Space and Conservation, Air Quality, Public Facilities, and Park and Recreation Elements. The GP 2025 is available online at <http://www.riversideca.gov/planning/gp2025program/>.

2.6.3 City of Riverside Municipal Code

The City's Municipal Code complements the GP 2025. The Municipal Code, which contains among other ordinances, the City's Zoning Code, is a mechanism to implement and enforce the goals, objectives, policies and programs articulated in the GP 2025. Many of the potential environmental concerns considered in this DEIR are adequately addressed through application of regulations contained in the Municipal Code. The Municipal Code is available online at <http://www.riversideca.gov/municode/>.

2.6.4 Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan (SCBPSP) and EIR

Originally known as the Box Springs Industrial Park Specific Plan, the *Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan* (SCBPSP) was originally adopted April 10, 1984 and has been amended 14 times. The SCBPSP describes a planned industrial park consisting of approximately 920 acres of industrial and commercial uses and a 480 acre wilderness park (Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park) within an approximately 1,500 acre area. The purpose of the SCBPSP is to assure efficient, orderly, and attractive development. To provide for orderly development, the SCBPSP was coordinated with the Sycamore Canyon Specific Plan and the General Development Plan for the Sycamore Canyon Park. The SCBPSP is available online at http://www.riversideca.gov/planning/pdf/SpecificPlans/scbp-plan-reso/plan_doc.pdf.

The SCBPSP was the result of a complex series of circumstances. As the only large, undeveloped area of land not previously subject to detailed planning analysis, the site had been identified as a potential significant opportunity in economic revitalization studies conducted in 1978. A number of studies covering the area occurred between when the Specific Plan was adopted. Important factors in these studies were preserving the land now known as Sycamore Canyon Regional Park and establishing land uses that would be compatible with what is now known as the March Air Reserve Base Airport Compatibility Plan. A good portion of the property within the SCBPSP is impacted by the C1 – Primary Approach/Departure Zone and D – Flight Corridor Buffer Compatibility Criteria that limits other uses, such as residential uses, in this area.

2.6.5 Sycamore Canyon Specific Plan and EIR

The Sycamore Canyon Specific Plan (SCSP) was originally adopted on April 10, 1984 to further the voter's intent shown by the passage of Proposition R to protect natural hillside and arroyo areas. Overall development levels established by Proposition R are the basis of the SCSP, but the location and density of development was shifted within the SCSP area boundaries. In this manner, it was possible to allow for the protection of the Canyon as a complete ecosystem, to the extent possible within the limitations of the SCSP area and adjacent lands. The major thrust of the SCSP was to identify which areas are most appropriately preserved as open space to protect the various natural resources in and around the Canyon. The SCSP called for preservation of over 920 acres of land of which about 450 acres are involved in the main canyon or its tributaries and the steep surrounding slopes. The remaining 470 acres include sensitive wildlife areas and archaeological areas as well as linking areas, many of which have other special features such as rock outcroppings.

The SCSP did provide for the development of perimeter portions of the site with residential and some commercial uses while protecting areas in and around the Canyon for open space. The relationships between SCSP and the Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan were studied and recommendations providing for coordination between the two plans were included within both Plans. The proposed residential uses under the Sycamore Canyon Specific Plan were broken out of the SCSP and were instead covered by the Lusk Highlander Specific Plan.

2.6.6 Sycamore Highlands Specific Plan (Formerly known as the Lusk Highlander Specific Plan)

This specific plan was prepared in order that development of the parent 411± acre Sycamore Highlands property would be accomplished in an orderly and coordinated manner. This parcel was originally a part of the larger 637± acre Sungold Ranch. Subsequently, the former Lusk Company and the Highlander Water Associates entered into an agreement covering 411± acres of the property.

During the same period, the City began studying the Sycamore Canyon area with the intent of preserving the canyon in an open space to protect valuable plant and wildlife habitats, and to allow public active and passive recreation opportunities wherever compatible.

In order to achieve the above-mentioned open space and recreation goals, and to provide property owners within and adjacent to Sycamore Canyon an opportunity to develop in the area, the City prepared the Sycamore Canyon Specific Plan. A large portion of Sycamore Highlands, (351± acres) falls within the Sycamore Canyon Specific Plan boundary. The remaining 60± acres of Sycamore Highlands, located adjacent to the City boundary in Riverside County known as LAFCO No.86-14-5, was annexed to the City of Riverside on July 8, 1986 by Resolution No. 16168. Since the 60± acre annexation area was not addressed in the Sycamore Canyon Specific Plan, the Sycamore Highlands Specific Plan covers the entire 411± acre property.

2.6.7 Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park Stephen's Kangaroo Rat Management Plan and Updated Conceptual Development Plan.

The *Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Management Plan and Updated Conceptual Development Plan* was prepared with two purposes: update the park's conceptual development plan and provide a coordinated Maintenance/Management Plan for the endangered Stephens' kangaroo rat (SKR). Because the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park was designated as a core reserve in the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the SKR, the City was required to prepare a Maintenance/Management Plan for the core reserve. The plan is available online at the City of Riverside's website:

http://www.riversideca.gov/planning/pdf/SpecificPlans/SycCynMnmgtPlan_UpdatedConceptualPlan.pdf.