



Environmental Initial Study

AGENDA ITEM NO.:
WARD: 4

1. **Case Number:**
2. **Project Title:** Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place Gates/Overlook Parkway Project
3. **Hearing Date:** To be determined
4. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside
Community Development Department
3900 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92522
5. **Contact Person:** Diane Jenkins
Phone Number: (951) 826-5625
6. **Project Location:** The proposed project involves the local roadway system in the eastern portion of the City of Riverside and southeast of State Route 91 (SR-91).
7. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** City of Riverside
Community Development Department
3900 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92522
8. **General Plan Designation:** Residential, Commercial-Retail, Commercial-Business/Office, and Agricultural
9. **Zoning:** Primarily residential with a mix of
10. **Description of Project:** The proposed project involves the analysis of four scenarios as follows:
 - **Scenario 1** — Gates closed to through traffic, no connection of Overlook Parkway: Under Scenario 1, both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place gates would remain in place and be closed until Overlook Parkway is connected to the east across the Alessandro Arroyo, to Alessandro Boulevard, and a connection westerly of Washington Street is built to get the traffic to SR-91.
 - **Scenario 2** — Gates removed, no connection of Overlook Parkway: Under Scenario 2, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed, and there would be no connection of Overlook Parkway across the Alessandro Arroyo. Overlook Parkway and required connection to the SR-91 would remain on the General Plan 2025 Master Plan of roadways for future buildout.
 - **Scenario 3** — Gates removed, Overlook Parkway connected: Under Scenario 3, the gates at Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed, and Overlook Parkway would be connected between Via Vista Drive and Sandtrack Road with the construction of a fill crossing and over the Alessandro Arroyo with a bridge crossing, allowing for a through connection to Alessandro Boulevard. The connection to the SR-91 would not be considered and would be removed from the Master Plan of Roadways in the General Plan 2025.

- **Scenario 4** — Gates removed, Overlook Parkway connected and the Proposed C Street constructed west of Washington Street: Under Scenario 4, both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place gates would be removed and Overlook Parkway would be connected east across Alessandro Arroyo and to Alessandro Boulevard. In addition, a roadway (the Proposed C Street) would also be extended west of Washington Street to provide a connection to SR-91.

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

Crystal View Terrace, Green Orchard Place, and Overlook Parkway are located south of SR-91 and west of Interstate 215 in the eastern portion of the City of Riverside. The local roadways are in an area developed primarily with residential uses in the Alessandro Heights and Canyon Crest neighborhoods. The residential land uses near Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place are categorized as hillside residential and very low density. The project vicinity includes an open space area for the Alessandro Arroyo that is west of Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park. The project vicinity also includes Victoria Avenue, a historic corridor and scenic parkway. Victoria Avenue is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and designated as Cultural Heritage Landmark No. 8 by the City.

Overlook Parkway is included as an east-west arterial from Washington Street to Alessandro Boulevard in the General Plan 2025; however, Overlook Parkway is not connected between Via Vista Drive and approximately 500 feet west of Sandtrack Road and over the Alessandro Arroyo between Crystal View Terrace and Via Vista Drive. In addition, Overlook Parkway does not extend west past Washington Street; therefore, a direct connection to SR-91 does not exist from Overlook Parkway.

Crystal View Terrace is a local road, and Green Orchard Place is a collector road that connects to Overlook Parkway, an arterial road, and Kingdom Drive, a collector road, respectively. In connection with the approval of two separate tract maps, gates at Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place were installed to prevent cut-through traffic until Overlook Parkway was completed across the Alessandro Arroyo. The gate on Crystal View Terrace is approximately 0.17 mile south of Overlook Parkway. The gate on Green Orchard Place is approximately 0.44 mile south of Kingdom Drive. The gates, installed as mitigation for the two approved tract maps, are designed to allow emergency vehicle access. However, the gates are opened and closed by residents at undetermined intervals without the knowledge or permission of the City.

Alessandro Boulevard, Arlington Avenue, Madison Street, Trautwein Road, and SR-91 are major roadways that border the project vicinity. March Air Reserve Base and Sycamore Canyon Business Park lie southeast and east of the project vicinity. To the north and northwest of the project vicinity are the University of California-Riverside, Riverside Municipal Airport, and the Santa Fe/Union Pacific Railroad, which runs roughly parallel to SR-91. Natural features in the vicinity of the project vicinity include Lake Matthews to the southwest and the Santa Ana River to the northwest.

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

- a. City Council: Approval of one of the scenarios described for the proposed project and certification of the EIR
- b. City Council: For Scenario 2, approval of an amendment to the General Plan 2025
- c. Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB): Approval of Construction General Permit for SWPPP compliance; Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification for impacts to jurisdictional wetland resources.
- d. California Department of Fish and Game: Approval of Section 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement for impacts to jurisdictional wetland resources.
- e. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE): Approval of Section 404 Nationwide Permit Program for impacts to jurisdictional wetland resources.

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

- a. City of Riverside General Plan 2025

- b. City of Riverside General Plan 2025 Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forest Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse natural Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signature _____

Date _____

Printed Name & Title Diane Jenkins, Principal Planner

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

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Open Space and Conservation Element, General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards and Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, and Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways) SCENARIO 1: There would be no substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Under this scenario, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would remain in place and be closed. Thus, there would be no impact . SCENARIO 2: There would be no substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Under this scenario, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed. Removal of the gates from the public right-of-way would not affect a scenic vista. There would be no impact . SCENARIO 3: This scenario involves construction of a fill crossing and bridge that has the potential to result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: Scenario 4 has the potential to result in a substantial adverse impact to a scenic vista from the construction of new roadways. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.				
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1b. Response: (Source: Caltrans California Scenic Highway Mapping System) SCENARIO 1: There would be no substantial adverse effect on scenic resources within a state scenic highway. No state scenic highways are located within the project area. Thus, there would be no impact . SCENARIO 2: There would be no substantial adverse effect on scenic resources within a state scenic highway. No state scenic highways are located within the project area. Thus, there would be no impact . SCENARIO 3: This scenario has the potential to damage scenic resources. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: This scenario has the potential to damage scenic resources. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Zoning Code, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines) SCENARIO 1: The visual character or quality of the site would not be substantially degraded. Under this scenario, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would remain in place and be closed. Thus, there would be no impact . SCENARIO 2: The visual character or quality of the site would not be substantially degraded. Under this scenario, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed to allow cut-through traffic. Thus, there would be no impact . SCENARIO 3: This scenario has the potential to result in a change in the visual character or quality of the arroyo and eastern drainage area along Overlook Parkway. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: This scenario has the potential to result in a change that would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the arroyo, eastern drainage area along Overlook Parkway, and the Arlington Heights Greenbelt with the completion of Overlook Park and the construction of a the Proposed C Street. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.				
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: There would be no new sources of light or glare generated under this scenario that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: There would be no new sources of light or glare generated under this scenario that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario has the potential to create new sources of substantial light and glare. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario also has the potential to create new sources of substantial light and glare. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
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 effect, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>2a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability & General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: No farmland would be impacted under this scenario. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: No farmland would be impacted under this scenario. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: No farmland would be impacted under this scenario. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Under this scenario, prime, unique or farmland so statewide importance could be converted to non-agricultural use. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: No farmland would be impacted under this scenario. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: No farmland would be impacted under this scenario. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: No farmland would be impacted under this scenario. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Existing zoning for agricultural use exists in the area of the Proposed C Street. This represents a potentially significant impact and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				
<p>2c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, Biological Resources Technical Report for the Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by RECON Environmental, Inc., April 2012)</p> <p>Of the vegetation communities and land cover types present in the immediate vicinity of Overlook Parkway and Washington Street, no forestland or timberland was mapped.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: No forestland or timberland would be impacted under this scenario. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: No forestland or timberland would be impacted under this scenario. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: No forestland or timberland would be impacted under this scenario. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: No forestland or timberland would be impacted under this scenario. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2d. Response: (Source: Biological Resources Technical Report for the Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by RECON Environmental, Inc., April 2012)</p> <p>As indicated under, 2b, above, no forestland is present within the project site or environs.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: No forestland or timberland would be impacted under this scenario. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: No forestland or timberland would be impacted under this scenario. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: No forestland or timberland would be impacted under this scenario. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: No forestland or timberland would be impacted under this scenario. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>2e. Response: (Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 -- Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table, Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones - RC Zone and RA-5 Zone and GIS Map – Forest Data)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: No farmland would be impacted under this scenario. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: No farmland would be impacted under this scenario. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: No farmland would be impacted under this scenario. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: There is a possibility that farmland could be converted to non-agricultural use. The conversion of farmland represents a potentially significant impact and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
3. AIR QUALITY.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3a. Response: (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), General Plan 2025 FPEIR)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not conflict with or obstruct implantation of the applicable air quality plan.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not conflict with or obstruct implantation of the applicable air quality plan. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: The easterly extension of Overlook Parkway could conflict with the applicable air quality plan. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: The westerly extension of Overlook Parkway could conflict with the applicable air quality plan. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2003 AQMP, URBEMIS 2007 Model, EMFAC 2007 Model)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: The connection of Overlook Parkway could contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Both the connection of Overlook Parkway and construction of the Proposed C Street could contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2003 Air Quality Management Plan, URBEMIS 2007 Model, EMFAC 2007 Model)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: The connection of Overlook Parkway could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Both the connection of Overlook Parkway and construction of the Proposed C Street could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2003 Air Quality Management Plan, URBEMIS 2007 Model, EMFAC 2007 Model)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: The connection of Overlook Parkway could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Both the connection of Overlook Parkway and construction of the Proposed C Street could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3e. Response: (Source: NA)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not create objectionable odors. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not create objectionable odors. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could create objectionable odors during construction. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could create objectionable odors during construction. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4a. Response: (Source: Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, Biological Resources Technical Report for the Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by RECON Environmental, Inc., April 2012)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any sensitive species. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any sensitive species. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: The connection of Overlook Parkway over the arroyo could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on sensitive species. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Both the connection of Overlook Parkway and construction of the Proposed C Street could modify habitat for sensitive species. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4b. Response: (Source: Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, Biological				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>Resources Technical Report for the Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by RECON Environmental, Inc., April 2012)</i></p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4c. Response: <i>(Source: Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, Biological Resources Technical Report for the Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by RECON Environmental, Inc., April 2012)</i></p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4d. Response: <i>(Source: Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, Biological Resources Technical Report for the Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by RECON Environmental, Inc., April 2012)</i></p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not 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. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not 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. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: As the proposed connection of Overlook Parkway is outside of a Criteria Cell, no formal wildlife corridors exist within the project footprint; however, the potential for either project construction or completion of the roadway to interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors is potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: As the proposed connection of Overlook Parkway and alignment for the Proposed C Street are outside of a Criteria Cell, no formal wildlife corridors exist within the project footprint; however, the potential for either project construction or completion of the roadway to interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors is potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.</p>				
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
<p>4e. Response: (Source: <i>Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, 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 (2007) Biological Resources Technical Report for the Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by RECON Environmental, Inc., April 2012</i>)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario may conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. 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, including Riverside Municipal Code Section 16.72.040 establishing the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) mitigation fee and Section 16.40.040 establishing the Threatened and Endangered Species Fees. Additionally, the City of Riverside's Urban Forestry Policy Manual provides guidelines for the preservation and protection of the City's tree heritage and the urban forest. The manual includes guidelines for the planting, pruning, preservation and removal of all trees in City right-of-ways and recreational facilities. Scenario 3 could conflict with the City's Urban Forestry policies. This represents a potentially significant impact and will be analyzed further in the Land Use Chapter of the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: See response for Scenario 3, above. Impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the Land Use Chapter of the EIR.</p>				
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4f. Response: (Source: <i>Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan,, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Biological Resources Technical Report for the Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by RECON Environmental, Inc., April 2012</i>)</p> <p>The project vicinity is part of the City of Riverside and City of Norco Plan Areas for the Western Riverside County MSHCP, but is not located within, or adjacent to, a Criteria Cell. Since the project is not intended to be part of a Conservation Area (i.e. not located in a Criteria Cell), and complies with the survey requirements of the Western Riverside County MSHCP, any biological impacts that could occur as a result of the proposed project are mitigated through the Western Riverside County MSHCP.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not conflict with any HCP or NCCP. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not conflict with any HCP or NCCP. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not conflict with any HCP or NCCP. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not conflict with any HCP or NCCP. Thus, there would be no impact.</p>				
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>5a. Response: (Source: <i>Cultural Resources Survey for the Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project, Riverside, California, RECON Environmental, Inc., April 2012</i>)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Thus, there would be no impact.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>5b. Response: (Source: Cultural Resources Survey for the Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project, Riverside, California, RECON Environmental, Inc., April 2012)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>5c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3, Riverside County TLMA GIS)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not destroy a unique paleontological resource/site or geologic feature. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not destroy a unique paleontological resource/site or geologic feature. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: The proposed connection of Overlook Parkway is located in an area designated with a low sensitivity for paleontological resources, and impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Although the proposed connection of Overlook Parkway is located in an area designated with a low sensitivity for paleontological resources, the area of the Proposed C Street is located in an areas designated with a high sensitivity for paleontological resources. Therefore, this scenario could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>5d. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not disturb any human remains. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not disturb any human remains. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could disturb human remains. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could disturb human remains. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Publication 42.				
<p>6i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones & General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p> <p>The primary purpose of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. Unlike damage from ground shaking, which can occur at great distances from the fault, impacts from fault rupture are limited to the immediate area of the fault zone where the fault breaks along the surface. According to the City’s General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, there are no known active or potentially active fault systems trending toward or through the project vicinity. The proposed project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone and the potential for damage due to fault rupture is considered remote.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to rupture of a known earthquake fault. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to rupture of a known earthquake fault. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to rupture of a known earthquake fault. The area where the connection of Overlook Parkway would occur is not within a fault zone. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to rupture of a known earthquake fault. The area where the connection of Overlook Parkway and the Proposed C Street would occur is not within a fault zone. Thus, there would be no impact.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6ii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to strong seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to strong seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
iv. Landslides?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to landslides. Thus, there would be no impact.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to landslides. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to landslides. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to landslides. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6b. Response: (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)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6c. 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, 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)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6d. Response: (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)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not be located on expansive soil. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not be located on expansive soil. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: Project components under this scenario could be located on an expansive soil. Soil types that exist in the project area include Cienega, Hanford, and Vista, which all have a low shrink-swell potential. However, a site-specific geotechnical investigation would be required before a grading permit is issued. This would reduce impacts to less than significant.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Project components under this scenario could be located on an expansive soil. The construction of the Proposed C Street could be on expansive soil. A site-specific geotechnical investigation would be required before a grading permit is issued. This would reduce impacts to less than significant.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6e. Response: SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not involve septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Thus, there would be no impact . SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not involve septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Thus, there would be no impact . SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not involve septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Thus, there would be no impact . SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not involve septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Thus, there would be no impact .				
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7a. Response: The project would not generate new or additional trips. However, each scenario would affect vehicle traffic patterns and the average trip length in the county, including vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Because the transportation-related emissions contribute to existing emissions in the County of Riverside, they will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 1: This scenario could indirectly generate GHG emissions. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 2: This scenario could indirectly generate GHG emissions. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 3: This scenario could generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: This scenario could generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.				
b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7b. Response: SCENARIO 1: This scenario could indirectly generate GHG emissions. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 2: This scenario could indirectly generate GHG emissions. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 3: This scenario could conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for reducing GHG emissions. See response to 7a above. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: This scenario could conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for reducing GHG emissions. See response to 7a above. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8a. Response: SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not involve the transport, use, or dispose of hazardous materials. Thus, there would be no impact . SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not involve the transport, use, or dispose of hazardous materials. Thus, there would be no impact . SCENARIO 3: This scenario would involve the connection of Overlook Parkway, which is an existing transportation corridor used for transport of people and goods, including hazardous materials. Upon completion of the project, the roadway would continue to be used for the transport of people and goods, including hazardous materials. No permanent on-site use or disposal would occur with project implementation. The proposed scenario would not increase the likelihood of accident or upset conditions that could occur as a result. During construction activities, there may be small quantities of hazardous materials associated with construction equipment such as fuels, lubricants, and solvents, present within the project area. Oversight by the appropriate federal, state, and local agencies, and compliance by the new development with applicable regulations related to the handling, storage and disposal of hazardous materials would cause the project to have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively through the implementation of standard requirements and ordinances protecting the public or the environment from the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: See response to Scenario 3, above. Impacts associated with the potential short-term use of hazardous materials during construction are considered less than significant . This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8b. Response: SCENARIO 1: Under this scenario, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would remain in place and be closed. Therefore, this scenario would not release hazardous materials into the environment. Thus, there would be no impact . SCENARIO 2: Under this scenario, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed. Therefore, this scenario would not release hazardous materials into the environment. Thus, there would be no impact . SCENARIO 3: See response above to 8a under Scenario 3. In summary, compliance with existing regulations would ensure that the public would not be exposed to any significant hazard related to hazardous materials as a result of Scenario 3. As such, impacts associated with the upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be less than significant directly, indirectly, and cumulatively. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: See response above to 8a under Scenario 3. This scenario would not release hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant . This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.				
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8c. Response: (<i>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</i>) SCENARIO 1: Under this scenario, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would remain in place and be closed. Therefore, this scenario would not emit hazardous emissions into the environment. Thus,				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: Under this scenario, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed. Therefore, this scenario would not emit hazardous emissions into the environment. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: There are no existing schools within 0.25 mile of the project site. Construction activities associated with this scenario would not emit hazardous emissions, nor would any hazardous materials, substances, or waste be handled within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Thus, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Washington Elementary School, located near the intersection of Victoria Avenue and Jane Street, is located over 1,000 feet from the Proposed C Street, which would be a transportation corridor used for transport of people and goods, including hazardous materials. Upon completion of the project, the roadway would be used for the transport of people and goods, including hazardous materials. No permanent on-site use or disposal would occur with project implementation. The proposed scenario would not increase or decrease the likelihood of accident or upset conditions that could occur as a result. During construction activities, there may be small quantities of hazardous materials associated with construction equipment such as fuels, lubricants, and solvents. Federal, state, and City of Riverside regulations and policies regarding the use of hazardous material would be followed. Impacts associated with hazardous emissions, and the use of hazardous materials during construction, are considered less than significant. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.</p>				
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-5 – Hazardous Waste Sites; GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7-A – CERCLIS Facility Information, Figure 5.7-B – Regulated Facilities in TRI Information and 5.7-C – DTSC EnviroStor Database Listed Sites; DTSC EnviroStar Database, accessed 1/27/12; SWRCB GeoTracker Database, accessed 1/27/12)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: The area associated with this scenario is not located on a hazardous materials site. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: The area associated with this scenario is not located on a hazardous materials site. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: The area associated with this scenario is not located on a hazardous materials site. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: The area associated with this scenario is not located on a hazardous materials site. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas)</p> <p>The project site lies within the “airport environs” of March Air Reserve Base (Riverside GP2025 PEIR, 2007). The closest public airports to the project area are the Riverside Municipal Airport and the Flabob Airport. The Riverside Municipal Airport is located approximately two miles west of the project area, and the Flabob Airport is located approximately three miles north west of the project area. The project area is outside the Airport Influence Area for both the Riverside Municipal Airport and the Flabob Airport. The project includes only roadway and infrastructure improvements and does not propose to introduce any new residents or permanent centers of employment within the project area.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas)</p> <p>The closest private airstrip to the project area is the Lake Mathews Airport, located approximately 4.5 miles southwest of the project area.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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)</p> <p>The City of Riverside has an extensive Emergency Operations Plan, created by the Emergency Management Office. The Emergency Management Office within the Riverside Fire Department coordinates emergency response and maintains the emergency operations plan, which outlines the City's planned response to emergency situations and disasters. The project would not affect these existing emergency service plans and operations.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Removal of the gates on Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place could reduce emergency response times. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The connection of Overlook Parkway would potentially improve traffic flow and could aid the City's emergency response and evacuation efforts; therefore, there would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Construction activities associated with this scenario may necessitate the temporary closure of road segments or portions of travel lanes within the area. These temporary closures are not expected to significantly impact an emergency response or evacuation plan. Once construction activities are completed, the improved roadway and potential for improved traffic flow and additional routes that could aid the City's emergency response and evacuation efforts; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>8h. Response: (<i>Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Hazard Areas, GIS Map VHFSZ 2010</i>) The project area is not located within or adjacent to a fire hazard area as identified in the City's General Plan Public Safety Element. SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people or structures to wildland fires. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people or structures to wildland fires. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not expose people or structures to wildland fires. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not expose people or structures to wildland fires. Thus, there would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
<p>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</p>	☒	☐	☐	☐
<p>9a. Response: (<i>Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Beneficial Uses Receiving Water</i>) SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Thus, there would be no impact. SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Thus, there would be no impact. SCENARIO 3: This scenario could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: See response above for Scenario 3. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
<p>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</p>	☒	☐	☐	☐
<p>9b. Response: SCENARIO 1: This scenario is not expected to have or result in any groundwater needs, nor would it interfere with groundwater recharge. There would be no impact. SCENARIO 2: This scenario is not expected to have or result in any groundwater needs, nor would it interfere with groundwater recharge. There would be no impact. SCENARIO 3: This scenario may result in the temporary depletion of groundwater supply. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: This scenario may result in the temporary depletion of groundwater supply. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
<p>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</p>	☒	☐	☐	☐
<p>9c. Response: (<i>Source: Preliminary Improvement Plans</i>) SCENARIO 1: This scenario is not expected to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. There would be no impact. SCENARIO 2: This scenario is not expected to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. There would be no impact.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3 could alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Scenario 4 could alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9d. Response: (Source: Preliminary Improvement Plans)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario is not expected to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario is not expected to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or immediate vicinity, in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or immediate vicinity, in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9e. Response: (Source: Preliminary Improvement Plans)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not create or contribute runoff water. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not create or contribute runoff water. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9f. Response:</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not create or contribute runoff water. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not create or contribute runoff water. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3 involves the construction of a bridge over the Alessandro Arroyo and a fill section, which together would connect Overlook Parkway to the east. The proposed project does not involve use of, or change to, groundwater resources, nor does the project involve discharge of wastes that could impact groundwater quality; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: See response for Scenario 3, above. In addition to the fill crossing and bridge for Overlook Parkway, Scenario 4 also would construct the Proposed C Street west of Washington. Impacts would be less than significant. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>9g. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas) No housing is proposed under any Scenario. No alterations to floodplains would occur under any Scenario that would result in housing being located 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.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a 100-year flood hazard area and would not involve any housing. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a 100-year flood hazard area and would not involve any housing. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a 100-year flood hazard area and would not involve any housing. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a 100-year floodplain, nor the construction of any housing. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas) As indicated on the City of Riverside General Plan exhibit, PS-4, “Flood Hazard Areas”, no 100- or 500-year flood zones are located within proximity to the proposed improvements under any Scenario.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located a 100-year flood hazard area. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a 100-year flood hazard area. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a 100-year flood hazard area. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a 100-year floodplain. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas) As indicated on the City of Riverside General Plan exhibit, PS-4, “Flood Hazard Areas”, no dam inundation areas are located within proximity to the proposed improvements under any Scenario.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: A portion of the area associated with this scenario is within the Prenda Dam inundation area. However, this scenario would not involve housing or structures that would expose people to injury or death involving flooding. Impacts would be less than significant. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>9j. Response: <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.8 – Hydrology and Water Quality)</i></p> <p>Due to the City’s distance from the ocean, there is no foreseeable risk of tsunami (tidal wave) inundation. Seiches are oscillations in enclosed bodies of water caused by seismic waves. No enclosed water bodies are located within proximity to the project area. Mudflows associated with erosion may also occur in portions of the community. According to the City’s General Plan FEIR, significant mudflows associated with erosion and fire damage may also occur near the Santa Ana River, Lake Hills, Norco Hills, Box Springs Mountain area and the nine arroyos found within the City’s planning area. The project would not place new housing or other structures within an area subject to mudflows.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario consists of a roadway and does not include any housing or inhabitable structures and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No impact would result. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario consists of a roadway and does not include any housing or inhabitable structures and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No impact would result. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:				
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>10a.Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Circulation and Community Mobility Element)</i></p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not physically divide an established community. The gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place are to remain until Overlook Parkway is connected easterly (General Plan 2025). There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not physically divide an established community. The gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not physically divide an established community. The roadway would be constructed, as outlined in the General Plan 2025, over the Alessandro Arroyo and east to Alessandro Boulevard. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario may physically divide an established community. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>10b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Title 19 – Zoning 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)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would conflict with policies established in the General Plan 2025. This represents a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would conflict with policies established in the General Plan 2025. This represents a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>This represents a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would conflict with policies established in the General Plan. This represents a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would conflict with policies established in the General Plan 2025. This represents a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>10c. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP))</p> <p>See Response 4f above.</p>				
<p>11. MINERAL RESOURCES.</p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>11a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure OS-1 – Mineral Resources, FPEIR Section 5.10, Mineral Resources)</p> <p>None of the four scenarios involve the extraction of mineral resources. No mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state have been identified within the project area. The project site is not, nor is it adjacent to, a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the City’s General Plan, Specific Plan or other land use plan, with the exception of the western extension, as detailed under Scenario 4, below. Thus, there is no evidence that the project would result in a significant adverse impact on mineral resources. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: There are no known mineral resources within area associated with this scenario, and as such, this scenario would have no impact on mineral resources. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: There are no known mineral resources within area associated with this scenario, and as such, this scenario would have no impact on mineral resources. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: There are no known mineral resources within area associated with this scenario, and as such, this scenario would have no impact on mineral resources. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: According to Figure OS-1 – Mineral Resources, “Rock Products” occur within the vicinity of the Proposed C Street. However, according to the General Plan FPEIR, 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.)” 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.</p>				
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				
<p>11b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)</p> <p>The GP 2025 FEIR determined that there are no specific areas with the City or Sphere area, which have locally-important mineral resource recovery sites and that the implementation of the General Plan would not significantly preclude the ability to extract state-designated resources; therefore, there is no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: There are no known mineral resources within area associated with this scenario, and as such, this scenario would have no impact on mineral resources. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: There are no known mineral resources within area associated with this scenario, and as such, this scenario would have no impact on mineral resources. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: There are no known mineral resources within area associated with this scenario, and as such, this scenario would have no impact on mineral resources. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: See response to 11a above under Scenario 4. Impacts associated with the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site would be less than significant.</p>				
12. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12a. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, 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, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario could result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario could result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12b. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, 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, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: Construction activities associated with this scenario could potentially increase the levels of ground-borne vibration or noise, but would not generate or expose people to excessive ground-borne vibration or noise. Although ground-borne vibration and noise levels from construction could be perceived as a nuisance to residential uses, vibration from construction equipment is typically not severe. Impacts would be less than significant. This</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Similar to Scenario 3, construction activities associated with this scenario could potentially increase the levels of ground-borne vibration or noise, but would not generate or expose people to excessive ground-borne vibration or noise. Impacts would be less than significant. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
<p>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12c. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, 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, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)</p> <p>The proposed project would not create any new permanent stationary sources that would increase the ambient noise environment. However, a permanent increase in ambient noise levels would result from the change in traffic patterns on roadways in the project vicinity.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not increase ambient noise levels on affected roadway segments to levels that exceed residential standards. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: Under this scenario, changes in circulation could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity associated with vehicular traffic. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: The extension of Overlook Parkway easterly over the arroyo could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels associated with vehicular traffic. This represents a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: The extension of Overlook Parkway westerly to Madison Avenue could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels associated with vehicular traffic. This represents a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
<p>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction Equipment Noise Levels, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not involve construction, and would therefore not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not involve construction, and would therefore not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. There would be no impact.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
<p>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12e. Response: (Source: General Plan, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contour)</p> <p>The project site lies within the “airport environs” of March Air Reserve Base, but is not located within the airport noise contours. The closest public airports to the project area are the Riverside Municipal Airport and the Flabob Airport. The Riverside Municipal Airport is located approximately two miles west of the project area, and the Flabob Airport is located approximately three miles north west of the project area. The project area is located outside both the Airport Influence Areas and airport noise contours for both the Riverside Municipal Airport and the Flabob Airport. The project includes only roadway and infrastructure improvements and does not propose to</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>introduce any new residents or permanent employment within the project area; therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: Scenario 1 would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: Scenario 2 would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3 would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Scenario 4 would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12f. Response: (<i>Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas</i>)</p> <p>The closest private airstrip to the project area is the Lake Mathews Airport, located approximately 4.5 miles southwest of the project area. Noise from aircraft operations at Lake Mathews Airport would not impact the project area.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This Scenario would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with a private airstrip. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This Scenario would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with a private airstrip. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This Scenario would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with a private airstrip. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This Scenario would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with a private airstrip. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
<p>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</p> <p>Would the project result in:</p>				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>13a. Response:</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not induce substantial population growth directly. The connection of Overlook Parkway easterly to Alessandro Boulevard would not indirectly induce population growth in an area. Several objectives in the General Plan specifically account for the connection of Overlook Parkway over the Alessandro Arroyo (see Objectives LU-17 and CCM-4). Therefore, this was also accounted for in population growth estimates. Furthermore, almost all of the area surrounding the project area associated with this scenario has been developed (i.e., the connection would not provide a new road to an undeveloped area). Rather, the connection would be providing a more efficient route for residents that currently reside near the project area to get to arterial roads, such as Alessandro Boulevard, Arlington Avenue, and eventually to Interstate 215. Impacts would be less than significant. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not directly induce substantial population growth through the addition of housing or employment. Under Scenario 4, the easterly connection of Overlook Parkway would be implemented (as described under Scenario 3), also, the Proposed C Street would be extended west of Washington Street to provide a connection to SR-91. Under Scenario 4, the Proposed C Street would connect from Washington Street to Madison Street. The proposed alignment would bisect the Arlington Heights Greenbelt, an area characterized by low-density</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>residential and primarily agrarian uses. The development of the Proposed C Street through this area could potentially induce growth and development within this agricultural area.</p> <p>In 1979, City of Riverside voters passed Proposition R, the “<i>Taxpayer’s Initiative to Reduce Costly Urban Sprawl by Preserving the City of Riverside’s Citrus and Agricultural Lands, Its Unique Hills, Arroyos and Victoria Avenue,</i>” which calls for the preservation of agriculture through application of the RA-5-Residential Agricultural Zone to two specific areas of the City, including the Arlington Heights Greenbelt.</p> <p>Subsequently, in 1987, voters approved Measure C, entitled “<i>Citizens’ Rights Initiative to Reduce Costly Urban Sprawl, to Reduce Traffic Congestion, to Minimize Utility Rate Increases and to Facilitate Preservation of the City of Riverside’s Citrus and Agricultural Lands, its Scenic Hills, Ridgelines, Arroyos and Wildlife Areas.</i>” Measure C amended Proposition R by adding policies to promote agriculture. Policies established by Measure C relevant to the proposed project include: protecting the Greenbelt streets from heavy traffic and minimizing the extension of City services and urban infrastructure into agricultural land areas, except as needed for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>In order for additional growth to occur within the Greenbelt area, both Proposition R and Measure C would need to be repealed, which would require a vote by popular referendum. Therefore, with adequate growth controls already in place, implementation of Scenario 4 would not result in indirect growth inducement and impacts would be less than significant. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13b. Response: (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer, aerial photos)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not displace existing housing. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not displace existing housing. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not displace existing housing. There is no housing that exists within the roadway alignment associated with this scenario. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not displace existing housing. There is no housing that exists within the roadway alignments associated with this scenario. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13c. Response: (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer, aerial photos)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not displace substantial numbers of people. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not displace substantial numbers of people. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not displace substantial numbers of people. There is no housing that exists within the roadway alignment associated with this scenario. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not displace substantial numbers of people. There is no housing that exists within the roadway alignments associated with this scenario. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14a. Response: (<i>Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1; Esparza. Will Serve Letter Response. April 26, 2011</i>) The project does not propose any development that would increase the demand for services in the project vicinity. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities. SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities. There would be no impact ; however, the current status of services and response times will be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities. There would be no impact . Services will be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities. There would be no impact . Services will be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities. There would be no impact . Services will be addressed in the EIR.				
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14b. Response: (<i>Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers</i>) See response to 14a. SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities. There would be no impact . SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities. There would be no impact . SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities. There would be no impact . SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities. There would be no impact .				
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14c. Response: SCENARIO 1: Scenario 1 would not involve the addition of housing units resulting in any student generation. Therefore, no impact related to demand for schools would result from this Scenario. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 2: Scenario 2 would not involve the addition of housing units resulting in any student generation. Therefore, no impact related to demand for schools would result from this Scenario. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3 includes the connection of Overlook Parkway and would not involve the addition of housing units resulting in any student generation. Therefore, no impact related to demand for schools will result from this project. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: Scenario 4 includes the connection of Overlook Parkway along with construction of the Proposed C Street but would not involve the addition of housing units resulting in any student generation. Therefore, no impact related to demand for schools will result from this project. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.				
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14d. Response: SCENARIO 1: Scenario 1 would not involve the addition of housing units resulting in any increase in population. Therefore, no impact related to demand for parks would result from this Scenario. This issue will not be addressed				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: Scenario 2 would not involve the addition of housing units resulting in any increase in population. Therefore, no impact related to demand for parks would result from this Scenario. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3 would not involve the addition of housing units resulting in any increase in population. Therefore, no impact related to demand for parks would result from this Scenario. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Scenario 4 would not involve the addition of housing units resulting in any increase in population. Therefore, no impact related to demand for parks would result from this Scenario. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14e. Response:</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario does not include any improvement or any new use, requiring new public facilities or services. No impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario does not include any improvement or any new use, requiring new public facilities or services. No impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would include improvements to an existing public roadway, Overlook Parkway, which is maintained by the City of Riverside. 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. Therefore, implementation of Scenario 3 would have a less than significant effect on maintenance of public facilities. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would include improvements to an existing public roadway, Overlook Parkway, which is maintained by the City of Riverside. The improvements include construction of a bridge and fill section that together would complete the easterly connection of Overlook Parkway, along with a the Proposed C Street 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 effect on maintenance of public facilities. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
15. RECREATION.				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>15a. Response:</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: Increase in demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities generally occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 1 does not include any new development, no increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expected. No impacts would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: Increase in demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities generally occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 2 does not include any new development, no increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expected. No impacts would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: Increase in demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities generally occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 3 includes only the connection of Overlook Parkway, no increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expected. No impacts would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Increase in demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities generally occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 4 includes only the connection of Overlook Parkway and the Proposed C Street, no increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expected. No impacts would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
15b. Response: SCENARIO 1: This Scenario does not include any recreational facility or any new use, requiring the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 2: This Scenario does not include any recreational facility or any new use, requiring the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3 includes only the easterly connection of Overlook Parkway and does not include any recreational facility or any new use, requiring the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: Scenario 4 includes only the easterly connection of Overlook Parkway along with construction of the Proposed C Street and does not include any recreational facility or any new use, requiring the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.				
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project result in:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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) SCENARIO 1: This scenario could conflict with an adopted plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 2: This scenario could conflict with an adopted plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 3: This scenario could conflict with an adopted plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: This scenario could conflict with an adopted plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.				
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>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)</i></p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario could conflict with an applicable congestion management program. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario could conflict with an applicable congestion management program. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could conflict with an applicable congestion management program. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could conflict with an applicable congestion management program. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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))</p> <p>The proposed project will not result in impacts to air traffic. The project vicinity includes an area within the Airport Environs for the March Air Reserve Base, and a small portion of the Proposed C Street (under Scenario 4 only), is located within the Airport Environs for the Riverside Municipal Airport. However, the project itself would not result in an increase in air traffic levels, nor would it involve a change in location of air traffic patterns.</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No impact would occur and this issue will not be discussed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No impact would occur and this issue will not be discussed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No impact would occur and this issue will not be discussed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No impact would occur and this issue will not be discussed in the EIR.</p>				
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>16d. Response: (Source: Project Site Plans, Lane Striping and Signing Plans)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario does not include the construction of any roadway improvements; no impacts would occur.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario does not include the construction of any roadway improvements; no impacts would occur.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>16e. Response: (Source: California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, Municipal Code, and Fire Code)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario could result in inadequate emergency access. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario could result in inadequate emergency access. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could result in inadequate emergency access. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could result in inadequate emergency access. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>16f. Response: (Source: FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation and Community Mobility and Education Elements)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. This impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</p>				
17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project result in:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17a. Response:</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: 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 applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. No impact would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: 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 applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. No impact would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: 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 applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. No impact would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: 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 applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. No impact would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17b. Response:</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: The project does not include any new land use that would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; therefore, no environmental impacts associated with the construction of such facilities would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: The project does not include any new land use that would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; therefore, no environmental impacts associated with the construction of such facilities would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: The project does not include any new land use that would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; therefore, no environmental impacts associated with the construction of such facilities would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>SCENARIO 4: The project does not include any new land use that would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; therefore, no environmental impacts associated with the construction of such facilities would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: Scenario 1 would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. No impact would occur.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: Scenario 2 would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. No impact would occur.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3, which includes a bridge and fill section for the connection of Overlook Parkway, would also construct a continuation of the existing onsite storm drain system within the roadway. The storm drain would be sized to accommodate projected post-construction flows and provide water quality treatment benefits prior to discharging to the Santa Ana River. The extension of the existing onsite storm drain system would occur within the right-of-way for Overlook Parkway and not result in off-site impacts. Impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be discussed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Similar to Scenario 3, Scenario 4 includes the connection of Overlook and the extension of storm drain facilities in the roadway which will be installed concurrent with construction. In addition, Scenario 4 proposes the construction of the Proposed C Street. New storm drain facilities would be constructed within the right-of-way in conjunction with the roadway extension. No off-site impacts would occur. Impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17d. Response: (Source: 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, RPU Master Plan)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: Scenario 1 would not include any land use or improvements necessitating water use. No impact would occur.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: Scenario 2 would not include any land use or improvements necessitating water use. No impact would occur.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: Roadway improvements associated with Scenario 3 are located within the service area of Riverside Public Utilities (RPU) District. Existing domestic water lines within Overlook Parkway would be extended within the right-of-way. 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. Because the connection of Overlook Parkway is consistent with the City’s General Plan 2025, water demand associated with the proposed roadway improvements has been accounted for in RPU’s Urban Water Management Plan. Therefore, impacts associated with water supply for Scenario 3 would be less than significant. This issue will not be discussed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Roadway improvements associated with Scenario 4 are located within the service area for the RPU. Existing domestic water lines in Overlook Parkway would be extended within the right-of-way. 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. In addition to water transmission lines, public fire hydrants for the fire protection water supply would be constructed along the Proposed C Street in accordance with Municipal Code Section 16.32.065. Because the eastern connection of Overlook Parkway and the Proposed C Street are consistent with the City’s General Plan, water demand associated with the proposed roadway improvements has been accounted for in RPU’s Urban Water Management Plan. Therefore, impacts associated with water supply for Scenario 4 would be less than significant. This issue will not be discussed in the EIR.</p>				
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
<p>17e. Response:</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: This scenario does not include any new land use that would require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; therefore, no impacts associated with the construction of such facilities would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: This scenario does not include any new land use that would require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; therefore, no impacts associated with the construction of such facilities would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: This scenario does not include any new land use that would require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; therefore, no impacts associated with the construction of such facilities would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: This scenario does not include any new land use that would require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; therefore, no impacts associated with the construction of such facilities would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17f. Response:</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: Scenario 1 would not include any new construction. Therefore, no construction-related or operational waste would be generated. No impacts would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: Scenario 2 would not include any new construction. Therefore, no construction-related or operational waste would be generated. No impacts would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3 would not generate operational waste; however, solid waste would be generated during the grading and construction phases of the project. However, the California Integrated Waste Management Act under the Public Resource Code requires that local jurisdiction 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 (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. Thus, the project would divert all grading waste from landfill disposal. The construction waste would be primarily comprised of recyclable materials. The City remains committed to continuing its existing waste reduction and minimization efforts with the programs that are available through the City. Contractors are required to divert at least 50% 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. Therefore, impacts associated solid waste disposal would be less than significant. This issue will not be discussed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Refer to Scenario 3, above. Impacts associated solid waste disposal would be less than significant. This issue will not be discussed in the EIR.</p>				
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17g. Response: (Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002 Landfill Facility Compliance Study)</p> <p>SCENARIO 1: Scenario 1 would not include any new construction. Therefore, no construction-related or operational waste would be generated. No impacts would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 2: Scenario 2 would not include any new construction. Therefore, no construction-related or operational waste would be generated. No impacts would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 3: Under Scenario 3, project activities would be required to divert at least 50% of the construction materials under the California Integrated Waste Management Act. Therefore, construction would not conflict with any federal, state, or local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts associated solid waste disposal would be less than significant. This issue will not be discussed in the EIR.</p> <p>SCENARIO 4: Refer to Scenario 3, above. Impacts associated solid waste disposal would be less than significant. This issue will not be discussed in the EIR.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18a. Response: (<i>Source: Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan</i>) ALL SCENARIOS: Scenarios 1 and 2 would not result in any impacts to biological or cultural resources, and therefore, would not 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. No impact would under occur under Scenarios 1 and 2. The proposed project sites associated with roadway improvements under Scenarios 3 and 4 supports suitable habitat for sensitive wildlife species. Additionally, the site has potential to contain significant historic and/or prehistoric resources. Therefore the analysis of the proposed project site shall be conducted and this analysis shall be presented in an EIR.				
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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18b. Response: (<i>Source: FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program</i>) ALL SCAENARIOS: The proposed project could potentially result in cumulative impacts. Analysis of cumulative effects and the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts will be fully evaluated in the EIR.				
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18c. Response: (<i>Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program</i>) ALL SCENARIOS: The proposed project could potentially result in substantial adverse effects to humans related to impacts from air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and noise. These issues will be further studied in the EIR.				

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151, Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).