

7.0 Effects Found Not to be Significant

Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15128, this chapter briefly describes the environmental issue areas that were determined during preliminary project review not to be significant, and were therefore not discussed in detail in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Significance thresholds used in this chapter are from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

7.1 Hazardous Materials and Public Health

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, impacts related to hazardous materials would be significant if the proposed Project would:

1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
2. 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?
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
4. 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?
5. 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?
6. 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?
7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine use, transport, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials. Neither Scenario 1 nor Scenario 2 would involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and thus would not create a significant public hazard. Scenarios 3 and 4

7.0 Effects Found Not to be Significant

involve the construction of roads, which is an existing transportation corridor used for transport of people and goods, including hazardous materials. Motor carriers and drivers involved in the transportation of hazardous materials must comply with federal and state regulations, and must obtain a hazardous materials transportation license from the California Highway Patrol. Roadways in the Project vicinity would continue to be used for the transport of hazardous materials, and would increase on roadways proportionally with other traffic (see Section 3.11 for impacts under each scenario). The Project would not, however, change the amount of hazardous materials that are transported or used in the City of Riverside (City). Therefore, the proposed Project would not increase or decrease the likelihood of accident or upset conditions that could occur as a result. None of the four scenarios would 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. Thus, there would be no impact.

During construction activities for Scenarios 3 and 4, there may be small quantities of hazardous materials associated with construction equipment such as fuels, lubricants, and solvents. City of Riverside standards and policies regarding the use of hazardous material would be followed. The Project does not include the permanent use of hazardous materials; therefore, impacts associated with the potential short-term use of hazardous materials during construction would be considered not significant.

There are several existing schools within the Project vicinity. Construction or other activities associated with these scenarios would not emit hazardous emissions or involve the handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Thus, there would be no impact.

Washington Elementary School is near the intersection of Victoria Avenue and Jane Street, and is less than one mile from the area associated with the Proposed C Street under Scenario 4. Victoria Avenue is a transportation corridor where hazardous materials are currently transported. During construction activities, there may be small quantities of hazardous materials associated with construction equipment such as fuels, lubricants, and solvents. City standards and policies regarding the use of hazardous material would be followed. Upon completion of the Proposed C Street, the roadway would likely continue to be used for the transport of people and goods, including hazardous materials; however, the Project does not include the emission or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Scenario 4 would not increase or decrease the likelihood of accident or upset conditions. Impacts associated with hazardous emissions and the handling of hazardous materials during construction would not be significant.

The General Plan 2025 Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) does not identify any hazardous waste sites in the Project vicinity (see Figure 5.7-1 of the FEIR), nor does it identify any industrial uses in the Project vicinity. None of the areas associated with the four scenarios are located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials

sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Thus, there would be no impact.

Project components proposed under Scenarios 1 through 4 are located within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) of the March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port (MARB/MIP). The Western Project Impact Area (PIA) associated with Scenario 4 is located within the AIA of the Riverside County Airport. None of these scenarios would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project vicinity. Scenarios 1 and 2 do not involve any land uses or construction activities, and thus would not result in a safety hazard. Scenarios 3 and 4 involve the construction of roadways. Neither the construction nor operation of the roadways would result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the Project vicinity.

Scenarios 2, 3, and 4 would require amendments to the General Plan 2025. Thus, if these scenarios are selected by decision makers, the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission would also be required to approve these scenarios. The Project does not propose uses that would conflict with existing airport operations (i.e., a structure that would conflict with height requirements). Overall, impacts associated with public airport safety hazards would be less than significant.

Additionally, none of the areas associated with the four scenarios are within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project vicinity. Thus, there would be no impact.

Local emergencies could be caused by conditions such as fire, flood, epidemic, and energy shortage. An emergency situation could be declared in response to situations which threaten the safety of persons and property within the City. The Emergency Management Office within the Riverside Fire Department coordinates emergency response, disaster preparedness, and disaster recovery by activating the California Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) and the National Incident Management System (NIMS). The Office prepares an Emergency Operations Plan, essential to the coordination of efforts in response to a major disaster, whatever its origin. Critical components of the plan include the establishment of multiple evacuation routes and the ability to provide emergency services in the swiftest manner possible. Figure PS-8.1 of the Public Safety Element in the General Plan 2025 identifies the City's major evacuation routes and existing infrastructure that can influence response times during a major disaster. Evacuation routes include major arterials in the City such as Central Avenue and Arlington Avenue, and along with Van Buren Boulevard, Alessandro Boulevard, Trautwein Road, Washington Street, Magnolia Avenue, and Victoria Avenue.

The Emergency Operations Plan is maintained by the Emergency Manager and is continuously updated. A major update of the plan is accomplished every five years. The plan is available to view at Riverside Public Library, Reference Section.

7.0 Effects Found Not to be Significant

In 2004, Riverside County Office of Emergency Services (OES) created the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) to identify and reduce risks at the local level and guide decision-makers in committing resources to reduce the effects of natural and other hazards. The City is a participant in the plan. The plan identifies critical facilities and the risks from a variety of hazards, including wildfires, flooding, and extreme weather.

Scenarios 1, 2, and 3 would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Under Scenario 3, the completion of Overlook Parkway east to Alessandro Boulevard would provide a new connection and the potential for improved traffic flow to aid the City's emergency response and evacuation efforts.

Construction activities associated with Scenario 4 may necessitate the temporary closure of road segments or portions of travel lanes within the area. These temporary closures are not expected to significantly impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Once construction activities are completed, the improved roadway and potential for improved traffic flow could aid the City's emergency response and evacuation efforts.

None of the four scenarios would impair implementation or physically interfere with adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. No impact would result from implementation of any of the four scenarios.

The General Plan 2025 FEIR does not identify any significant fire hazard areas in the Project vicinity (see Figure 5.7-3). None of the four scenarios would 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. Thus, there would be no impact.

7.2 Mineral Resources

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, impacts related to mineral resources would be significant if the proposed Project would:

1. 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?
2. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

The Project is not expected to 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. The Project vicinity is mapped as Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3), as classified by the State of

California and identified in the General Plan 2025 FEIR (see Figure 5.10-1 of the FEIR). MRZ-3 is a designation indicating that the area contains known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance. Limestone is known to occur on the eastern edge the Project vicinity near Alessandro Boulevard, but there have been no active mining operations in the Project vicinity for the past several decades, and there are none currently.

Significant mineral deposits are known or likely to occur along the northeastern edge of the City, and this area is protected under MRZ-2 in the City's General Plan 2025 to prevent incompatible land use development. In addition, Figure OS-1 – Mineral Resources, identifies rock products near the Proposed C Street. However, according to the General Plan 2025 FEIR, mining operations have not been active in the City of Riverside for decades. Further, the rock products are not classified as MRZ-2 (significant mineral deposits are present) or as SZ (Scientific Resource area containing unique or rare occurrences of rocks). The Project would have no direct or indirect effect on these areas. Therefore, impacts associated with the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be valuable to the region would be less than significant.

Because significant mineral deposits have not been identified in areas that would be affected by the Project, no impact would result under any of the four scenarios.

7.3 Population and Housing

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, impacts related to population and housing would be significant if the proposed Project would:

1. 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)?
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

None of the four scenarios include housing or any other components that would reasonably be expected to generate a substantial population increase; thus, there would be no impact. None of the four scenarios would displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There would be no impact.

7.0 Effects Found Not to be Significant

Specifically, Scenarios 1 and 2 involve maintaining or removing an existing traffic control device, and would therefore not induce substantial population growth either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

For Scenario 3, several objectives in the General Plan 2025 specifically account for the connection of Overlook Parkway over the Alessandro Arroyo (see Objectives LU-17 and CCM-4). Furthermore, the majority of the Project vicinity has been developed. The extension would not provide a new road to an undeveloped area, but would rather provide a more efficient route for residents that currently reside near the Project vicinity to get to arterial roads, such as Alessandro Boulevard and Arlington Avenue. This scenario would not change or alter the existing low-density zoning in this area, which also serves to reduce the possibility of inducing substantial population growth. Therefore, Scenario 3 would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure), and no impact is identified.

Similar to Scenario 3, Scenario 4 addresses several objectives in the General Plan 2025 which specifically account for the connection of Overlook Parkway over the Alessandro Arroyo. Further, the Proposed C Street in Scenario 4 also addresses a connection to State Route 91 (SR-91) in the western portion of the Project vicinity. Also, as with Scenario 3, much of the Project vicinity for Scenario 4 has been developed. Additionally, the area for the Proposed C Street is within the Arlington Heights Greenbelt, which was zoned RA-5-Residential Agricultural Zone through the approval of Proposition R: "Taxpayer's Initiative to Reduce Costly Urban Sprawl by Preserving Riverside's Citrus and Agricultural lands, Its Unique Hills, Arroyos and Victoria Avenue." The Proposed C Street would provide an alternate route for Washington Street and a more efficient route for residents that currently reside near the Project vicinity to get to arterial roads. Other roads in this area would be vacated or end in cul-de-sacs. Existing low-density zoning in the Project vicinity could also reduce the possibility of inducing substantial population growth. Scenario 4 would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly, and no impact is identified.

7.4 Public Services

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, impacts related to public services would be significant if the proposed Project would:

1. 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?
- b. Police protection?
- c. Schools?
- d. Parks?
- e. Other public facilities?

None of the four scenarios that comprise the Project propose any development that would increase the demand for services in the Project vicinity. Although there would be a redistribution of some vehicle trips on Project vicinity roadways, none of the four scenarios would alter land use designations or result in an increase in growth in the region beyond what has already been projected, planned for, and approved by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the City. Therefore, the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, including fire protection, police protection, schools, or parks. The analysis of how response times of the fire and police departments would be affected is discussed in Section 3.11, Transportation/Traffic.

In regards to other public facilities, Scenarios 1 and 2 do not include any improvement or any new use, requiring new public facilities or services. No impact would occur.

Scenario 3 would include improvements to an existing public roadway, Overlook Parkway, which is maintained by the City. The improvements include construction of a bridge and fill section that together would complete the connection of Overlook Parkway. The City would be responsible for long-term maintenance of the improvements following construction. This would not affect facilities for fire protection, police protection, schools, or parks. Therefore, implementation of Scenario 3 would have a less than significant impact on maintenance of public facilities.

Scenario 4 would include improvements to an existing public roadway, Overlook Parkway, which is maintained by the City. In addition to the connection of Overlook Parkway, Proposed C Street would be constructed between Washington Street and Victoria Avenue. The City would be responsible for long-term maintenance of the improvements following construction. Therefore, implementation of Scenario 4 would have a less than significant impact on maintenance of public facilities.

7.5 Recreational Resources

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, impacts related to recreational resources would be significant if the proposed Project would:

1. 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?
2. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The Project would not increase the demand for parks or other recreational facilities. Several narrow open space/reserve belts, as identified in the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR, trend southeast to northwest within the Project vicinity, north and south of Overlook Parkway. There are several City of Riverside multi-purpose recreational trails that traverse the Project vicinity. One County of Riverside trail cuts across the southeastern portion, while others lie within the vicinity of the Project boundary.

There are numerous neighborhood, community, and city parks scattered throughout the City of Riverside. The City's General Plan 2025 adopted a ratio requiring the provision of two acres of community park and one acre of neighborhood park per 1,000 residents. The City's maximum future projections show deficits for community and neighborhood parks.

None of the four scenarios propose the construction of new residential dwelling units or any other type of development which would 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.

None of the four scenarios include recreational facilities or requires the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Although there are parks within the Project vicinity, none are within the immediate areas of proposed Project features, such as the gates of Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place, Overlook Parkway, or the Proposed C Street. Therefore, no impacts to recreational resources would occur.

7.6 Utilities and Service Systems

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, impacts related to utilities and service systems would be significant if the proposed Project would:

1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
2. 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?
3. 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?
4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
5. 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?
6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The Project does not include any new land use that has the potential to generate wastewater; therefore, it would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The proposed Project is located within the service area of Riverside Public Utilities (RPU). The Project does not include any new land use that would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities; therefore, no environmental impacts associated with the construction of such facilities would occur.

Scenarios 1 and 2 involve the placement of a traffic control device and would have no impact on the provision of utility systems such as water or wastewater. Under Scenarios 1 and 2, water and wastewater would be conveyed through existing facilities. Scenario 3, which includes a bridge and fill section for the connection of Overlook Parkway, would extend existing utilities through the new segments of roadway concurrent with construction. Because the connection of Overlook Parkway is consistent with the City's General Plan 2025, water demand associated with the proposed roadway improvements

7.0 Effects Found Not to be Significant

has been accounted for in RPU's Urban Water Management Plan. The new pipes and storm drain facilities would be constructed to ensure a more efficient route for the transmission of water and storm drain flows.

Scenario 4 includes the connection of Overlook Parkway and the extension of water and storm drain facilities which would not increase demand or expand the system beyond that which has been planned. In addition, Scenario 4 proposes the construction of Proposed C Street where new water lines and storm drain facilities would be constructed within the right-of-way in conjunction with the roadway extension. The pipes and storm drain facilities would be sized to accommodate existing flows. Because the Project includes only roadway improvements, water demand would only be in conjunction with irrigation for right-of-way landscaping and would be minimal. Therefore, impacts associated with water supply for Scenario 4 would be less than significant.

Scenarios 1 and 2 would not involve construction-related or operational waste. No impacts would occur. Scenarios 3 and 4 would not generate operational waste; however, solid waste would be generated during the grading and construction phases for the roadways. The California Integrated Waste Management Act under the Public Resource Code requires that local jurisdiction divert at least 50 percent of all solid waste. The City is currently achieving a 60 percent diversion rate which exceeds state requirements (General Plan 2025 FEIR). The Project would not result in soil export and, therefore, would not result in the disposal of soil in a landfill. Vegetation cleared during grading would be recycled as green waste. Contractors are required to divert at least 50 percent of their construction materials. This can occur through recycling of materials at a certified City of Riverside recycling facility using the source separation or mixed source methods.

The solid waste and the construction materials are expected to be transported to the Robert A. Nelson Transfer Station and Materials Recovery Facility in the city of Riverside. This facility currently has the capacity to receive 4,000 tons of non-hazardous green waste and construction/demolition debris per day. As no demolition activities would occur, and no disposal of soil is required, the amount of waste generated during construction activities would be not be significant. The facility would have the capacity to accommodate waste generated during construction. Conformance to existing regulations would ensure that impacts associated solid waste disposal would be less than significant.