

Community Development Department Planning Division

# 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 JenkinsPhone 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 feet 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.

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

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

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

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

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

 $\square$ 

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 <u>City of Riverside</u>	

# **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. **Impacts Adequately Addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were with in the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measure which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

1111		S (AND SUPPORTING MATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1.		<b>ESTHETICS.</b> build the project:				
	a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	$\square$			
	1a.	<b>Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Open Space Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Pl Boulevards and Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Speci SCENARIO 1: There would be no substantial adverse effect	an 2025 FPI al Boulevards, t on a scenic v	EIR Figure 5. , and Table 5. ista. Under thi	<b>1-1</b> – Scenic <b>1-B</b> – Scenic I s scenario, the	and Specia Parkways) gates at both
		Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would reminpact. SCENARIO 2: There would be no substantial adverse effect Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be r way would not affect a scenic vista. There would be <b>no imp</b> SCENARIO 3: This scenario involves construction of a fil	et on a scenic v emoved. Remo act.	vista. Under thi	s scenario, the es from the pu	e gates at both ablic right-of
		substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. This impact is the EIR. SCENARIO 4: Scenario 4 has the potential to result in a	potentially s	ignificant and	will be analy	zed further in
		construction of new roadways. This impact is potentially si	gnificant and	will be analyz	ed further in tl	ne EIR.
	b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
		state scenic highways are located within the project area. The <i>SCENARIO 2</i> : There would be no substantial adverse efferent state scenic highways are located within the project area. The <i>SCENARIO 3</i> : This scenario has the potential to damage and will be analyzed further in the EIR. <b>SCENARIO 4</b> : This scenario has the potential to damage and will be analyzed further in the EIR.	ct on scenic re us, there woul scenic resource	sources within d be <b>no impac</b> es. This impac	a state scenic t. ct is potential	ly significar
	c.					
	•••	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
			025 FPEIR, 2 ould not be su Place would re rould not be su Place would Place would a change in th impact is <b>pot</b> a change that rea along Over	bstantially deg emain in place ubstantially deg be removed t e visual charac entially signif	graded. Under and be closed graded. Under o allow cut-th cter or quality <b>icant</b> and wil ntially degrad , and the Arlin	this scenario . Thus, ther this scenario rough traffic of the arroy l be analyze e the existin ngton Height

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2 Area, Title 19 – Article VIII – Chapter 19.556 – Lighting		ure 5.1-2 – Me		Lighting
<b>SCENARIO 1:</b> There would be no new sources of light of affect day or nighttime views in the area. Thus, there would be affect day of the area of the area.	d be no impact.			
SCENARIO 2: There would be no new sources of light of affect day or nighttime views in the area. Thus, there would SCENARIO 3: This scenario has the potential to create	d be <b>no impact</b> .			
<b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the <b>SCENARIO 4:</b> This scenario also has the potential to cre- is <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in t	EIR. ate new sources	-	-	-
2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:				
<ul> <li>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources a significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to t California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessmed Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservatia as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agricultur and farmland. In determining whether impacts to for resources, including timberland, are significant environment effect, lead agencies may refer to information complied by t California Department of Forestry and Fire Protective regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Lega Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by t California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</li> <li>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the mat prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping a Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agence</li> </ul>	he h			
to non-agricultural use? 2a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table) SCENARIO 1: No farmland would be impacted under thi SCENARIO 2: No farmland would be impacted under thi SCENARIO 3: No farmland would be impacted under thi SCENARIO 3: No farmland would be impacted under thi SCENARIO 4: Under this scenario, prime, unique or farm agricultural use. This impact is potentially significant and	Agricultural S s scenario. Thus s scenario. Thus s scenario. Thus nland so statewi	, there would b s, there would s, there would ide importance	be <b>no impact</b> . be <b>no impact.</b> be <b>no impact.</b> e could be conv	
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act contract?	a 🖂			
<ul> <li>2b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-3 – Figure 5.2-4 – Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural &amp; SCENARIO 1: No farmland would be impacted under thi SCENARIO 2: No farmland would be impacted under the SCENARIO 3: No farmland would be impacted under the SCENARIO 4: Existing zoning for agricultural use exists potentially significant impact and will be analyzed further c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code section</li> </ul>	Uses, and Title 1 s scenario. Thus, s scenario. Thus s scenario. Thus ts in the area of r in the EIR.	(9) , there would b s, there would s, there would	be <b>no impact</b> . be <b>no impact.</b> be <b>no impact.</b>	

SSUES (AND SUPPORTING NFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact		Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Production (as defined by Government Code sect 51104(g))?	ion			
2c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, Biological Re Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by RE				iew Terrace/
Of the vegetation communities and land cover types pro- Washington Street, no forestland or timberland was mapp <i>SCENARIO 1</i> : No forestland or timberland would be i This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 2</i> : No forestland or timberland would be i	esent in the im ed. mpacted under	mediate vicinity	γ of Overlook Γhere would b	e no impact
This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.	inpacted under	tills section.	incre would b	c no mpac
<b>SCENARIO 3:</b> No forestland or timberland would be i This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.	mpacted under	this scenario.	There would b	e no impac
<b>SCENARIO 4:</b> No forestland or timberland would be i This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.	mpacted under	this scenario.	There would b	e no impac
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest la to non-forest use?	ind			$\boxtimes$
<ul> <li>2d. Response: (Source: Biological Resources To Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by REG As indicated under, 2b, above, no forestland is present with SCENARIO 1: No forestland or timberland would be in This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 2: No forestland or timberland would be in This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: No forestland or timberland would be in This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 4: No forestland or timberland would be in This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment whi due to their location or nature, could result in conversion Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of for land to non-forest use?</li> <li>2e. Response: (Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 – A Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – D 19.100 – Residential Zones - RC Zone and RA-5 Zone an SCENARIO 1: No farmland would be impacted under the SCENARIO 3: No farmland would be impacted under</li></ul>	CON Environment thin the project mpacted under mpacted under mpacted under mpacted under mpacted under ch, of est Agricultural Ste esignated Farm nd GIS Map – is scenario. Thu	ental, Inc., Apr site or environs this scenario. T this scenario. T s, there would t us, there would t	<ul> <li><i>il</i> 2012)</li> <li>Chere would b</li> <li><i>Chere would b</i></li> <li><i>Che</i></li></ul>	e no impac e no impac e no impac e no impac
SCENARIO 4: There is a possibility that farmland could farmland represents a <b>potentially significant impact</b> and				conversion (
AIR QUALITY.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by applicable air quality management or air pollution cont district may be relied upon to make the follow determinations. Would the project:	rol ing			
<b>a.</b> Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applica	ble 🖂			
<b>a.</b> Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applica air quality plan?				

	S (AND SUPPORTING RMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> .		filcor por alcu		
	<b>SCENARIO 2:</b> This scenario would not conflict with or o Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> .	bstruct impla	ntation of the	applicable air	quality plan.
	<b>SCENARIO 3:</b> The easterly extension of Overlook Parkw This impact is <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed f			applicable air	quality plan.
	<b>SCENARIO 4:</b> The westerly extension of Overlook Parkw This impact is <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed f			applicable air	quality plan.
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	$\square$			
3b.	<b>Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Tab Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District? Model)				
	<b>SCENARIO 1:</b> This scenario would not violate any air qual projected air quality violation. Thus, there would be <b>no impa</b>	•	or contribute su	bstantially to	an existing or
	<b>SCENARIO 2:</b> This scenario would not violate any air qual projected air quality violation. Thus, there would be <b>no impa</b>	ity standard o	r contribute su	bstantially to	an existing or
	<i>SCENARIO 3:</i> The connection of Overlook Parkway could quality violation. This impact is <b>potentially significant</b> and	d contribute s			r projected air
	<i>SCENARIO 4:</i> Both the connection of Overlook Parkw contribute substantially to an existing or projected air qualit will be analyzed further in the EIR.	ay and cons	truction of the	e Proposed C	
с.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
3c.	<b>Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Tab Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management Distri- 2007 Model, EMFAC 2007 Model)				
	<i>SCENARIO 1</i> : This scenario would not result in a cumulati Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> .	vely consider	able net increa	ase of any crit	eria pollutant.
	<i>SCENARIO 2</i> : This scenario would not result in a cumulati Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> .	vely consider	able net increa	ase of any crit	eria pollutant.
	<i>SCENARIO 3:</i> The connection of Overlook Parkway could criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment analyzed further in the EIR.				
	<b>SCENARIO 4:</b> Both the connection of Overlook Parkway a a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria polluta impact is <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed furthe	nt for which			

	S (AND SUPPORTING MATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	$\square$			
	<b>Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Tab Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District 2007 Model, EMFAC 2007 Model) SCENARIO 1: This scenario could expose sensitive receptor	ct's 2003 Air	Quality Man	agement Plar	ı, ÜRBEMIS
	is <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the <i>SCENARIO 2</i> : This scenario could expose sensitive receptor	EIR. ors to substant			
	is <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the <i>SCENARIO 3:</i> The connection of Overlook Parkway co concentrations. This impact is <b>potentially significant</b> and w	uld expose se			ntial pollutan
	<i>SCENARIO 4:</i> Both the connection of Overlook Parkway a sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. analyzed further in the EIR.	and constructi		osed C Street	
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	$\square$			
	SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not create objectionable SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not create objectionable SCENARIO 3: This scenario could create objectionable of significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: This scenario could create objectionable of significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.	odors. Thus, dors during c	there would be onstruction.	e <b>no impact</b> . This impact	-
4. BIC	<b>DLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> puld the project:				
	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
	4a. Response:(Source: Western Riverside County Mull ResourcesResourcesTechnicalReportGreen Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by RECOL SCENARIO 1:This scenario would not a have substant	the N Environme	Crystal ntal, Inc., Apr	View il 2012)	Terrace
	modifications, on any sensitive species. Thus, there would be <i>SCENARIO 2</i> : This scenario would not a have substant modifications, on any sensitive species. Thus, there would be	e <b>no impact</b> . ial adverse e		·	C
	SCENARIO 3: The connection of Overlook Parkway over the directly or through habitat modifications, on sensitive spectral analyzed further in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: Both the connection of Overlook Parkway and habitat for sensitive species. This impact is <b>potentially signification</b> .	ies. This impa	act is <b>potentia</b> on of the Prop	ally significant	t and will be could modif
	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?				

	S (AND SUPPORTI MATION SOURCE				Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Green Orchard Plac		kway Project by I			Crystal ntal, Inc., Apr		Terrace/
	SCENARIO 1: This natural community. SCENARIO 2: This	Thus, there wou	ld be <b>no impact</b> .					
	natural community. <i>SCENARIO 3:</i> This community. This in	is scenario coul	d have a substanti					nsitive natural
	SCENARIO 4: This community. This im							nsitive natural
с.	Have a substantial						х. Г П	
U.	wetlands as defined (including, but not etc.) through dir	by Section 404 limited to, marg rect removal,	of the Clean Wat sh, vernal pool, co	er Act oastal,				
	interruption, or othe							
4c.	-		iverside County	-	-			
	Resources 1 Green Orchard Plac	Fechnical	1 0	for PECON	the V Environme	Crystal	View	Terrace/
	SCENARIO 1: This natural community. SCENARIO 2: This	s scenario would Thus, there wou	l not have a subst ld be <b>no impact</b> .	antial a	dverse effect	on any riparia	an habitat or c	
	natural community.					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	SCENARIO 3: Thi		-	al advei	rse effect on f	federally prote	cted wetlands	as defined by
	Section 404 of the C	lean Water Act.	This impact is <b>p</b>	otentia	lly significan	t and will be a	nalyzed furthe	er in the EIR.
	SCENARIO 4: This							
	Section 404 of the C			1	lly significan	t and will be a	nalyzed furthe	er in the EIR.
d.	Interfere substantia resident or migrate established native r or impede the use of	ory fish or wi esident or migr	Idlife species or atory wildlife cor	with	$\boxtimes$			
4d.	-		iverside County	Multip			ervation Pla	
		Technical	1 0	for	the	Crystal	View	Terrace/
	Green Orchard Plac					· · •		
	SCENARIO 1: This migratory fish or wir use of native wildlife	Idlife species of	with established	native	resident or n		•	
	SCENARIO 2: This migratory fish or wis use of native wildlife	Idlife species of	with established	native	resident or n			
	SCENARIO 3: As t	•			-	side of a Crite	ria Cell, no fo	ormal wildlife
	corridors exist withit the roadway to interestablished native re- the EIR.	in the project for rfere with the r	otprint; however, novement of any	the po native	tential for eit resident or r	her project co nigratory fish	nstruction or o or wildlife sp	completion of becies or with
	SCENARIO 4: As	the proposed c	onnection of Ove	rlook F	Parkwav and	alignment for	the Proposed	C Street are
	outside of a Criteria	Cell, no forma	l wildlife corridor	s exist	within the pr	oject footprint	; however, the	e potential for
	either project constr migratory fish or wi significant and will	uction or comp ildlife species o	letion of the roady r with established	way to	interfere with	h the moveme	nt of any nativ	ve resident or
e.	Conflict with any			ecting	$\boxtimes$			

(AND SUPPORTING MATION 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?				
Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by RECON SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not conflict with a resources. Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> . SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not conflict with a resources. Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> . SCENARIO 3: This scenario may conflict with local pr Implementation of the proposed project is subject to all appl related to the protection of biological resources and tree pre 16.72.040 establishing the Western Riverside County M mitigation fee and Section 16.40.040 establishing the Threa City of Riverside's Urban Forestry Policy Manual provide City's tree heritage and the urban forest. The manual includ removal of all trees in City right-of-ways and recreational far Forestry policies. This represents a <b>potentially significant</b> Chapter of the EIR.	City of Rive port for N Environment ny local poli olicies or ordicable Federa servation, incu ultiple Species tened and Enders guidelines f es guidelines f cilities. Scena t impact and	rside Urban I the Cry ntal, Inc., Apr cies or ordina cies or ordina linances prote l, State, and lo luding Riversi es Habitat Co dangered Spec for the planting ario 3 could co will be analyz	Forest Tree Postal View il 2012) ances protecti ances and biologic ances and ances ances an	ng biologica ng biologica ng biologica ang biologica cal resources nd regulation Code Sectio an (MSHCP ditionally, th tection of th servation an City's Urba the Land Us
<b>SCENARIO 4:</b> See response for Scenario 3, above. Impacts in the Land Use Chapter of the EIR.	are <b>potential</b>	ly significant a	and will be an	alyzed furthe
Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				$\boxtimes$
Response: (Source: Western Riverside County Multiple Sp – Figure OS-6 – Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Re Biological Resources Technical Report Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project by RECOM The project vicinity is part of the City of Riverside and City MSHCP, but is not located within, or adjacent to, a Criteria Conservation Area (i.e. not located in a Criteria Cell), and Riverside County MSHCP, any biological impacts that could through the Western Riverside County MSHCP. SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not conflict with any HO SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not conflict with any HO SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not conflict with any HO	eserve and Ot for the N Environment of Norco Plana a Cell. Since complies with d occur as a re- CP or NCCP. CP or NCCP. CP or NCCP.	ther Habitat C the Crystan antal, Inc., Apri- in Areas for the the project is in a the survey re- esult of the pro- Thus, there wo Thus, there wo Thus, there wo	Conservation 1 al View il 2012) e Western Rive not intended to equirements or oposed project puld be <b>no imp</b> puld be <b>no imp</b> puld be <b>no imp</b>	Plans (HCP Terrace erside Count o be part of f the Wester are mitigate pact. pact. pact.
LTURAL RESOURCES. uld the project:				
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	$\boxtimes$			
<b>Response:</b> (Source: Cultural Resources Survey for the Parkway Project, Riverside, California, RECON Environm SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not cause a substant resource. Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> . SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not cause a substant resource. Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> .	ental, Inc., Ap ial adverse cl	pril 2012) hange in the	significance o	f a historica

		S (AND SUPPORTING RMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
	<ul> <li>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historica resource. Thus, there would be no impact.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>						
	b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?					
	5b.	<b>Response:</b> (Source: Cultural Resources Survey for the	Crystal View	Terrace/Gree	n Orchard Pl	ace/Overlook	
		Parkway Project, Riverside, California, RECON Environm	ental, Inc., A <sub>l</sub>	oril 2012)			
		SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not cause a substantial	adverse chan	ge in the sign	ificance of an	archeological	
		resource. Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> . SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not cause a substantial	advarsa ahan	as in the sign	ficence of en	arabaalagiaal	
		resource. Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> .	auverse chan	ge in the sign		archeological	
		SCENARIO 3: This scenario could cause a substantial ad	dverse change	e in the signif	ficance of an	archeological	
		resource. This impact is <b>potentially significant</b> and will be	•				
		<b>SCENARIO 4:</b> This scenario could cause a substantial as resource. This impact is <b>potentially significant</b> and will be a			ficance of an	archeological	
	c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	$\boxtimes$				
	5c.	Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3, Riv	erside County	TLMA GIS)			
		SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not destroy a unique p	paleontologica	al resource/site	e or geologic t	feature. Thus,	
		there would be <b>no impact</b> .	1	.1		Sector There	
		SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not destroy a unique p there would be <b>no impact</b> .	paleontologica	ll resource/site	e or geologic	leature. Thus,	
		SCENARIO 3: The proposed connection of Overlook P.	arkway is loo	cated in an a	rea designated	l with a low	
		sensitivity for paleontological resources, and impacts would	be less than s	ignificant.	•		
		SCENARIO 4: Although the proposed connection of Overla					
		sensitivity for paleontological resources, the area of the Pro high sensitivity for paleontological resources. Therefore, thi					
		paleontological resource. This impact is <b>potentially signific</b>					
	d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	$\square$				
	5d.	<b>Response:</b> (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Arch Cultural Resources Sensitivity)	haeological S	ensitivity and	Figure 5.5-2	- Prehistoric	
		SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not disturb any human r					
		SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not disturb any human r			-		
		<b>SCENARIO 3:</b> This scenario could disturb human remain analyzed further in the EIR.	is. This impa	ct is potentia	lly significan	t and will be	
		SCENARIO 4: This scenario could disturb human remain	ns This impa	ct is <b>notentia</b>	llv significan	t and will be	
		analyzed further in the EIR.	is. This http://	et is potentia	ng significan		
6.	GI	EOLOGY AND SOILS.					
	Wo	ould 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					
L		2 2112101 of 111105 und Georogy Special		1	1		

SUES (AND SUPPORTING FORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Publication 42.				
6i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure F Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)	PS-1 – Regional F	ault Zones &	General Plan	2025 FPE
The primary purpose of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake used for human occupancy on the surface trace of action occur at great distances from the fault, impacts from faut where the fault breaks along the surface. According to are no known active or potentially active fault syste proposed project is not located within an Alquist-Priol	ive faults. Unlike alt rupture are limit the City's Generations trending towa	damage from ted to the imm al Plan 2025 P rd or through	ground shakin ediate area of t ublic Safety E the project v	ng, which c the fault zo clement, the ricinity. T
fault rupture is considered remote. SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people		otential substa	ntial adverse	effects due
rupture of a known earthquake fault. Thus, there would <i>SCENARIO 2</i> : This scenario would not expose people rupture of a known earthquake fault. Thus, there would	e or structures to p	otential substa	ntial adverse o	effects due
<b>SCENARIO 3:</b> This scenario would not expose people rupture of a known earthquake fault. The area where the a fault zone. Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> .	e or structures to p			
<b>SCENARIO 4:</b> This scenario would not expose people rupture of a known earthquake fault. The area where the would occur is not within a fault zone. Thus, there would	e connection of Ov			
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?				
6ii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR A SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people		-		effects due
<ul> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be not SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be not SCENARIO 3: This scenario could expose people or st seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially SCENARIO 4: This scenario could expose people or st</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>or structures to p</li> <li>impact.</li> <li>or structures to p</li> <li>impact.</li> <li>ructures to potential</li> <li>y significant and</li> <li>ructures to potential</li> </ul>	otential substa otential substa al substantial a will be ana al substantial a	ntial adverse of ntial adverse of dverse effects lyzed further dverse effects	effects due due to stro in the E
<ul> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be not SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be not SCENARIO 3: This scenario could expose people or st seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially SCENARIO 4: This scenario could expose people or st seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially significant sets seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially significant sets sets sets sets sets sets sets se</li></ul>	or structures to p impact. or structures to p impact. ructures to potentia y significant and ructures to potentia ificant and will be	otential substa otential substa al substantial a will be ana al substantial a	ntial adverse of ntial adverse of dverse effects lyzed further dverse effects	effects due due to stro in the E
<ul> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be not SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be not SCENARIO 3: This scenario could expose people or st seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially SCENARIO 4: This scenario could expose people or st seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially sign iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefacti</li> <li>6iii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure 12 Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Geotechnical Report)</li> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people</li> </ul>	e or structures to p <b>impact</b> . e or structures to p <b>impact</b> . ructures to potentia y significant and ructures to potentia ificant and will be on? PS-1 – Regional I Soils with High S e or structures to p	otential substa otential substa al substantial a will be ana al substantial a analyzed furth <i>Fault Zones, F</i> <i>hrink-Swell P</i> otential substa	ntial adverse of antial adverse of dverse effects lyzed further dverse effects her in the EIR. Digure PS-2 – otential, and A	due to stro in the E due to stro Liquefacta Appendix I
<ul> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be not SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be not SCENARIO 3: This scenario could expose people or st seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially SCENARIO 4: This scenario could expose people or st seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially sign iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefacti</li> <li>6iii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure 1 Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Geotechnical Report)</li> </ul>	e or structures to p <b>impact</b> . e or structures to p <b>impact</b> . ructures to potentia <b>significant</b> and ructures to potentia <b>ificant</b> and will be on? $\square$ <b>PS-1 – Regional I</b> <b>Soils with High S</b> e or structures to p 'hus, there would be or structures to p	otential substa otential substa al substantial a will be ana al substantial a analyzed furth <i>Fault Zones, F</i> <i>hrink-Swell P</i> otential substa e <b>no impact</b> . otential substa	ntial adverse of antial adverse of dverse effects lyzed further dverse effects her in the EIR.	effects due due to stro in the E due to stro Liquefacta Appendix I effects due
<ul> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be not SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be not SCENARIO 3: This scenario could expose people or st seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially SCENARIO 4: This scenario could expose people or st seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially sign iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefacti</li> <li>6iii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure 12 Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Geotechnical Report)</li> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people</li> </ul>	e or structures to p <b>impact</b> . e or structures to p <b>impact</b> . ructures to potentia <b>significant</b> and ructures to potentia <b>ificant</b> and will be on? $\square$ <b>PS-1 – Regional I</b> <b>Soils with High S</b> e or structures to p hus, there would b e or structures to p hus, there would b or structures to po	otential substa otential substa al substantial a will be ana al substantial a analyzed furth <i>Fault Zones, F</i> <i>hrink-Swell P</i> otential substa e <b>no impact</b> . otential substa e <b>no impact</b> .	Initial adverse of Initial adverse of dverse effects lyzed further dverse effects her in the EIR. Digure PS-2 – otential, and A Initial adverse of Initial adverse of the adverse of the a	due to stro in the E due to stro due to stro <i>Liquefacti</i> <i>Appendix I</i> effects due effects due
<ul> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be not SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people strong seismic ground shaking. Thus, there would be not SCENARIO 3: This scenario could expose people or st seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially SCENARIO 4: This scenario could expose people or st seismic ground shaking. This impact is potentially sign iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefacti</li> <li>6iii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure 1: Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Geotechnical Report)</li> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not expose people seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. T SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not expose people seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. T SCENARIO 3: This scenario could expose people or st seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.</li> </ul>	e or structures to p <b>impact</b> . e or structures to p <b>impact</b> . ructures to potentia y <b>significant</b> and ructures to potentia <b>ificant</b> and will be on? $\square$ <b>PS-1 – Regional I</b> <b>Soils with High S</b> e or structures to p 'hus, there would be or structures to potential This impact is <b>pot</b> or structures to potential or structu	otential substa otential substa al substantial a will be ana al substantial a analyzed furth <i>Fault Zones, F</i> <i>hrink-Swell P</i> otential substa e <b>no impact</b> . otential substa e <b>no impact</b> . tential substan <b>centially signif</b>	ntial adverse of untial adverse of dverse effects lyzed further dverse effects her in the EIR. <b>Gigure PS-2</b> – <b>Otential, and A</b> untial adverse of tial adverse e <b>ficant</b> and will utial adverse e	effects due due to stro in the El due to stro Liquefacti Appendix I effects due effects due l be analyz

**SCENARIO 1:** This scenario would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to landslides. Thus, there would be **no impact**.

	SUPPORTING DN SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
landslie SCENA landslie	<ul><li><b>ARIO 2:</b> This scenario would not expose people or s des. Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b>.</li><li><b>ARIO 3:</b> This scenario could expose people or structure des. This impact is <b>potentially significant</b> and will be</li></ul>	uctures to pot analyzed furt	otential substa tential substar her in the EIR	ntial adverse e	effects due to
	<b>ARIO 4:</b> This scenario could expose people or structure des. This impact is <b>potentially significant</b> and will be				effects due to
b. Result	in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	$\boxtimes$			
Soils, I SCENA no imp SCENA no imp SCENA signific SCENA	ARIO 2: This scenario would not result in substantial	<i>e, Title 17 – G</i> soil erosion o soil erosion o erosion or the	rading Code) or the loss of to or the loss of to loss of topsoi	opsoil. Thus, th opsoil. Thus, th I. This impact	nere would be nere would be is <b>potentially</b>
c. Be loc would potenti	ated on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that become unstable as a result of the project, and ally result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral ing, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
Genera Underl SCEN no imp SCEN unstabl SCEN	ARIO 2: This scenario would not be located on a geo	High Shrink - Soil Types, logic unit or a logic unit or so gic unit or so ly significant soil erosion	-Swell Potent and Appendi soil that is uns soil that is unst il that is unsta and will be a	<i>tial, Figure 5</i> <i>x E – Geotech</i> stable. Thus, th stable, or that wo analyzed furthe	<b>6-1 - Areas</b> <b>nical Report</b> ) here would be here would be yould become er in the EIR.
the U	ated on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of niform Building Code (1994), creating substantial b life or property?				
Types, Buildin SCEN SCEN in the site-spe impact SCEN the Pro	nse: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5 Figure 5.6-5 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potenting Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set of ARIO 1: This scenario would not be located on expant ARIO 2: This scenario would not be located on expant ARIO 3: Project components under this scenario cour project area include Cieneba, Hanford, and Vista, we exific geotechnical investigation would be required is to less than significant. ARIO 4: Project components under this scenario cour poposed C Street could be on expansive soil. A site- a grading permit is issued. This would reduce impacts	<i>al, Appendix</i> <i>ut in Title 16</i> sive soil. Thus sive soil. Thus ld be located hich all have before a grad d be located of specific geoto	<i>E</i> – <i>Geotechno</i> <i>of the Riversia</i> s, there would s, there would on an expansi a low shrink- ling permit is on an expansive chnical invest	<i>ical Report, a</i> <i>de Municipal</i> be <b>no impact</b> be <b>no impact</b> ve soil. Soil ty swell potentia issued. This	nd California Code) rpes that exist l. However, a would reduce onstruction of

	S (AND SUPPORTING RMATION 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?				
бе.	<ul> <li>Response: SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not involve septic tanks would be no impact.</li> <li>SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not involve septic tanks would be no impact.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not involve septic ta there would be no impact.</li> <li>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not involve septic ta there would be no impact.</li> </ul>	or alternative	e wastewater d ative wastewa	isposal system ter disposal sy	s. Thus, there ystems. Thus,
	REENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. fould the project:				
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	$\boxtimes$			
7a	<ul> <li>Response: The project would not generate new or additional trips. How and the average trip length in the county, including vehic related emissions contribute to existing emissions in the Co EIR. SCENARIO 1: This scenario could indirectly generate GHG will be analyzed further in the EIR.SCENARIO 2: This sc impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed furthe SCENARIO 3: This scenario could generate GHG en environment. This impact is potentially significant and will SCENARIO 4: This scenario could generate GHG em environment. This impact is potentially significant and will</li> </ul>	de miles trave ounty of River G emissions. The enario could r in the EIR. hissions that be analyzed f issions that	eled (VMT). I rside, they wil This impact is indirectly gen may have a further in the E may have a	Because the tr l be analyzed <b>potentially si</b> erate GHG en significant in IR. significant in	ransportation- further in the <b>gnificant</b> and nissions. This npact on the
b.	Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	$\boxtimes$			
7b	<ul> <li>Response:</li> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario could indirectly generate GHG will be analyzed further in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 2: This scenario could indirectly generate GHG will be analyzed further in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could conflict with an applica reducing GHG emissions. See response to 7a above. This further in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could conflict with an applica reducing GHG emissions. See response to 7a above. This further in the EIR.</li> </ul>	G emissions. T able plan, poli impact is <b>pot</b> ble plan, poli	This impact is icy or regulation entially signific cy or regulation	potentially signation of an agence icant and wilt	gnificant and y adopted for l be analyzed y adopted for

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
8.		AZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. buld the project:					
	a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			$\boxtimes$		
		SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not involve the transport would be no impact. SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not involve the transport would be no impact. SCENARIO 3: This scenario would involve the cont transportation corridor used for transport of people and good the project, the roadway would continue to be used for the materials. No permanent on-site use or disposal would occu would not increase the likelihood of accident or upset cond activities, there may be small quantities of hazardous mate fuels, lubricants, and solvents, present within the project are agencies, and compliance by the new development with app disposal of hazardous materials would cause the project to h cumulatively through the implementation of standard requ environment from the routine transport, use, or disposal of h the EIR. SCENARIO 4: See response to Scenario 3, above. Imp hazardous materials during construction are considered less	ort, use, or di nection of O ds, including b the transport o ur with project itions that cou- erials associa ca. Oversight b plicable regula ave a <b>less tha</b> irrements and hazardous mat	spose of hazar verlook Parky hazardous mat f people and g it implementation and occur as a ted with consecutive by the appropriations related to <b>n significant</b> is ordinances p erials. This is	dous material vay, which is erials. Upon goods, includi ion. The prop result. During truction equip iate federal, so to the handling mpact directly rotecting the sue will not be potential shor	s. Thus, there s an existing completion of ng hazardous osed scenario g construction ment such as tate, and local g, storage and r, indirectly or public or the e addressed in t-term use of	
	b.	EIR. 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?					
	8b.	<ul> <li>Bb. Response:</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>SCENARIO 4: See response above to 8a under Scenario 3. This scenario would not release hazardous materials into the EIR.</li> </ul>					
	c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one- quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?					
	8c.	<b>Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety and CalARP RMP Facilities in the Project Area, Figure 5.13-2 SCENARIO 1: Under this scenario, the gates at both Crysta in place and be closed. Therefore, this scenario would not	2 – <b>RUSD Bou</b> 1 View Terrac	undaries, Tabl	e 5.13-D RUS Drchard Place	<i>D Schools)</i> would remain	

	S (AND SUPPORTING EMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	there would be <b>no impact</b> .		incorporateu		
	SCENARIO 2: Under this scenario, the gates at both Cry	stal View Ter	rrace and Gree	n Orchard Pl	ace would
	removed. Therefore, this scenario would not emit hazardou <b>no impact</b> .				
	<b>SCENARIO 3:</b> There are no existing schools within 0.25 m with this scenario would not emit hazardous emissions, nor handled within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.	would any ha	zardous materi	als, substance	
	SCENARIO 4: Washington Elementary School, located near located over 1,000 feet from the Proposed C Street, which	would be a tra	ansportation co	orridor used fo	r transport
	people and goods, including hazardous materials. Upon co the transport of people and goods, including hazardous ma occur with project implementation. The proposed scenario v or upset conditions that could occur as a result. During c hazardous materials associated with construction equipmen and City of Riverside regulations and policies regarding the	aterials. No would not incr onstruction ac t such as fuel t use of hazard	permanent on- ease or decreas ctivities, there s, lubricants, a dous material y	-site use or di se the likelihoo may be small and solvents. I would be follo	sposal wo od of accid quantities Federal, sta wed. Impa
	associated with hazardous emissions, and the use of hazard than significant. This issue will not be addressed further in		s during constr	ruction, are co	onsidered I
d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous				$\square$
	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?				
	<ul> <li>EnviroStor Database Listed Sites; DTSC EnviroStar Databaccessed 1/27/12)</li> <li>A review of hazardous materials site lists compiled pursuar project site is not included on any such lists.</li> <li>SCENARIO 1: The area associated with this scenario is not be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 2: The area associated with this scenario is not be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: The area associated with this scenario is not be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: The area associated with this scenario is not be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 4: The area associated with this scenario is not</li> </ul>	nt to Governn located on a h located on a h located on a h	nent Code Sect azardous mate azardous mate azardous mate	tion 65962.5 f rials site. Thus rials site. Thus rials site. Thus	Yound that s, there wo s, there wo s, there wo
	be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.		azaruous mate		s, mere wo
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
8e.	Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Air	port Safety Zo	ones and Influ	ence Areas)	
	The project site lies within the "airport environs" of March A closest public airports to the project area are the Riverside M Municipal Airport is located approximately two miles wess approximately three miles north west of the project area. The both the Riverside Municipal Airport and the Flabob Airpor improvements and does not propose to introduce any new re- project area.	Air Reserve B Junicipal Airp t of the project ne project area t. The project	ase (Riverside oort and the Fla ct area, and th a is outside the t includes only	GP2025 PEIF abob Airport. 7 e Flabob Airp Airport Influe roadway and	The Rivers ort is loca ence Area infrastruct
	SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not result in a safety ha				-

	S (AND SUPPORTING RMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be addre	essed in the EI	=		
	SCENARIO 3: This scenario would not result in a safety ha	azard for peop	le residing or	working in the	e project area.
	Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be addre				
	SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not result in a safety ha			working in the	e project area.
	Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be addre		R.		
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?				$\boxtimes$
8f.	Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Air	oort Safety Zo	nes and Influ	ence Areas)	
	The closest private airstrip to the project area is the Lal southwest of the project area.	te Mathews A	Airport, locate	d approximat	ely 4.5 miles
	<b>SCENARIO 1:</b> This scenario would not result in a safety has Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be addressed and the statement of the statem	essed in the EI	R.	C	1 0
	<b>SCENARIO 2:</b> This scenario would not result in a safety ha Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be addre	essed in the EI	R.	C	1 0
	<b>SCENARIO 3:</b> This scenario would not result in a safety has there would be no impact. This issue will not be address the safety has the safe			working in the	e project area.
	Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be addre <b>SCENARIO 4:</b> This scenario would not result in a safety ha			working in the	project eres
	Thus, there would be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be addre	1 1	0	working in the	e project area.
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			$\square$	
<b>9</b> ~	Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.7 – H	aranda and I	lazandona Ma	toniala Citu	f Dinomaidala
og.	EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdi				y Riversiae s
	The City of Riverside has an extensive Emergency Operatio The Emergency Management Office within the Riverside maintains the emergency operations plan, which outlines the disasters. The project would not affect these existing emerge <i>SCENARIO 1</i> : This scenario would not impair implem emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 2</i> : This scenario would not impair implem emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Reference of the second s	Fire Departm e City's plan ency service p entation of of There would entation of of	ent coordinate ned response t lans and opera or physically be <b>no impac</b> or physically	es emergency o emergency tions. interfere with et. This issue interfere with	response and situations and a an adopted e will not be a an adopted
	Orchard Place could reduce emergency response times. T addressed in the EIR.				
	<b>SCENARIO 3:</b> This scenario would not impair implemented emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. T improve traffic flow and could aid the City's emergency response pairmont.	he connection	of Overlook	Parkway wou	ld potentially
	<b>no impact.</b> SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not impair implem emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. C necessitate the temporary closure of road segments or por closures are not expected to significantly impact an emerg activities are completed, the improved roadway and potent could aid the City's emergency response and evacuation effor	onstruction ac tions of trave gency respons ial for improv	tivities associated lanes within e or evacuation ed traffic flow	ated with this the area. The on plan. Once v and addition	scenario may ese temporary construction al routes that
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?				$\boxtimes$

	S (AND SUPPORTING RMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8h	. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fi	re Hazard Area	_	HFSZ 2010)	I
<b>UII</b>	The project area is not located within or adjacent to a fire h Safety Element.		· -		al Plan Publi
	<b>SCENARIO</b> 1: This scenario would not expose people of <b>impact</b> . This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.	or structures to	wildland fires	s. Thus, there	would be <b>n</b>
	<b>SCENARIO 2:</b> This scenario would not expose people of <b>impact</b> . This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.				
	<b>SCENARIO 3:</b> This scenario would not expose people of <b>impact</b> . This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.				
	SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not expose people of impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.	r structures to	wildland fires	s. Thus, there	would be <b>n</b>
	YDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. ould the project:				
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharg requirements?	e 🖂			
	there would be <b>no impact</b> . <b>SCENARIO 2:</b> This scenario would not violate water quithere would be <b>no impact</b> . <b>SCENARIO 3:</b> This scenario could violate water quality significant and will be analyzed further in the Discense above for Scenario 3. This further in the EIR.	tandards or was	ste discharge r	equirements.	This impact i
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfer substantially with groundwater recharge such that ther				
	would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rat of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level whic would not support existing land uses or planned uses for	f e h			
9b.	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	f e h r	ndwater needs	, nor would it	interfere wi
9b.	<ul> <li>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)?</li> <li><b>Response:</b> SCENARIO 1: This scenario is not expected to have or resignoundwater recharge. There would be no impact. SCENARIO 2: This scenario is not expected to have or resignoundwater recharge. There would be no impact. SCENARIO 3: This scenario may result in the tempo potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the local scenario.</li></ul>	f e h r ult in any grou ult in any grou rary depletion EIR.	ndwater needs of groundwa	, nor would it ter supply. T	interfere wit
9b.	<ul> <li>would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production ratio 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)?</li> <li><b>Response:</b></li> <li><i>SCENARIO 1:</i> This scenario is not expected to have or resignoundwater recharge. There would be <b>no impact</b>.</li> <li><i>SCENARIO 2:</i> This scenario is not expected to have or resignoundwater recharge. There would be <b>no impact</b>.</li> <li><i>SCENARIO 3:</i> This scenario may result in the tempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the lempo <b>potentially significant</b> and will be <b>potentially significant</b> and will be <b>potentially si</b></li></ul>	f e h r ult in any grou ult in any grou trary depletion EIR. rary depletion EIR.	ndwater needs of groundwa	, nor would it ter supply. T	interfere wit
<b>9b.</b> c.	<ul> <li>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)?</li> <li><b>Response:</b> SCENARIO 1: This scenario is not expected to have or resign groundwater recharge. There would be no impact. SCENARIO 2: This scenario is not expected to have or resign groundwater recharge. There would be no impact. SCENARIO 3: This scenario may result in the tempor potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the level.</li></ul>	f e h r ult in any grou ult in any grou ult in any grou rary depletion EIR. rary depletion EIR. a	ndwater needs of groundwa	, nor would it ter supply. T	interfere wi his impact

	S (AND SUPPORTING RMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<b>SCENARIO 3:</b> Scenario 3 could alter the existing drainag result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. This further in the EIR.	impact is <b>po</b>	he site or area tentially signi	ficant and wil	ll be analyzed
	<b>SCENARIO 4:</b> Scenario 4 could alter the existing drainag result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. This further in the EIR.				
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
9d.	<b>Response:</b> ( <i>Source: Preliminary Improvement Plans</i> ) <i>SCENARIO 1</i> : This scenario is not expected to substantiall There would be <b>no impact</b> .				
	SCENARIO 2: This scenario is not expected to substantiall There would be <b>no impact</b> . SCENARIO 3: This scenario could alter the existing drainag which would result in flooding on- or off-site. This impact is the EIR.	ge pattern of t	he site or imm	ediate vicinity	, in a manner
	<b>SCENARIO 4:</b> This scenario could alter the existing drainage which would result in flooding on- or off-site. This impact is the EIR.				
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?	$\boxtimes$			
9e.	<b>Response:</b> (Source: Preliminary Improvement Plans) SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not create or contribute SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not create or contribute SCENARIO 3: This scenario could create or contribute run planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantia	runoff water. ' off water that	There would b would exceed	e <b>no impact.</b> I the capacity	
	<b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the El SCENARIO 4: This scenario could create or contribute run planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantia <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the El	R. off water that 1 additional s	would exceed	I the capacity	of existing or
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			$\square$	
9f.	<b>Response:</b> SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not create or contribute SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not create or contribute SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3 involves the construction of a which together would connect Overlook Parkway to the ex change to, groundwater resources, nor does the project invo quality; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. T SCENARIO 4: See response for Scenario 3, above. In	runoff water. ' bridge over t ast. The prop lve discharge his issue will p	There would b he Alessandro posed project of of wastes that not be address	e <b>no impact.</b> Arroyo and does not invol t could impact ed in the EIR.	lve use of, or t groundwater
	Parkway, Scenario 4 also would construct the Proposed C S significant. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.				
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?				$\boxtimes$

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

9g. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas)

	. Response: (Source: General Flan 2025 Figure F5-4 – Flood Hazara 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.					
	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 <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.					
	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 <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.					
	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 <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.					
	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 <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.					
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which					
	would impede or redirect flood flows?					
9h.	. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas)					
	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.					
	SCENARIO 1: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located a 100-year flood hazard area.					
	There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.					
	SCENARIO 2: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a 100-year flood hazard					
	area. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.					
	<i>SCENARIO 3:</i> This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a 100-year flood hazard area. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.					
	SCENARIO 4: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a 100-year floodplain.					
	There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.					
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss,					
	injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a					
	result of the failure of a levee or dam?					
9i.	<b>Response:</b> (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.					
	SCENARIO 1: This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation are					
	and would not involve any structures. There would be no impact. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.					
	and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 2</i> : This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area					
	and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 2</i> : This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.					
	and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 2</i> : This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 3</i> : This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area					
	and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 2</i> : This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 3</i> : This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.					
	and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 2</i> : This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 3</i> : This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 3</i> : This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 4</i> : A portion of the area associated with this scenario is within the Prenda Dam inundation area.					
	and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. 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 <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. 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 <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. 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					
j.	and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 2</i> : This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 3</i> : This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 3</i> : This scenario does not include improvements that would be located within a dam inundation area and would not involve any structures. There would be <b>no impact.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 4</i> : A portion of the area associated with this scenario is within the Prenda Dam inundation area.					

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

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

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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

*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.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:			
Would the project:			
a. Physically divide an established community?	$\square$		

**10a.Response:** (Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Circulation and Community Mobility Element)

*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**.

*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**.

*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**.

*SCENARIO 4:* This scenario may physically divide an established community. 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
<ul> <li>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?</li> </ul>				
10b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 20. – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Title 19 – Z Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Build Guidelines) SCENABIO I: This correction would conflict with policies	oning Code, ' lings and Con	Title 7 – Nois Istruction and	e Code, Title Citywide Des	17 – Grading ign and Sign
<ul> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would conflict with policies e potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the I SCENARIO 2: This scenario would conflict with policies e potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the I This represents a potentially significant impact and will be</li> </ul>	EIR. stablished in EIR.	the General Pl		_
SCENARIO 3: This scenario would conflict with policie potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the I SCENARIO 4: This scenario would conflict with policies e potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the I	EIR. established in			1
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	$\boxtimes$			
<b>10c. Response:</b> (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP) See Response 4f above.	e OS-6 – Stepi	hen's Kangaro	oo Rat (SKR)	Core Reserve
11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				
<b>11a. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure OS-1 - Resources)	- Mineral Re	esources, FPE	EIR Section 5	5.10, Mineral
None of the four scenarios involve the extraction of mineral to the region and the residents of the state have been identifi- it adjacent to, a locally important mineral resource recovery or other land use plan, with the exception of the western extension is no evidence that the project would result in a significant a be addressed in the EIR.	ed within the p site delineated ension, as deta dverse impact	project area. T l in the City's iled under Sce on mineral re	The project site General Plan, enario 4, below sources. This	e is not, nor is Specific Plan 7. Thus, there issue will not
SCENARIO 1: There are no known mineral resources with scenario would have no impact on mineral resources. There SCENARIO 2: There are no known mineral resources with scenario would have no impact on mineral resources. There we have no impact on mineral resources.	would be <b>no i</b> n iin area assoc	<b>mpact.</b> iated with this		
<ul> <li>SCENARIO 3: There are no known mineral resources. There of SCENARIO 3: There are no known mineral resources with scenario would have no impact on mineral resources. There of SCENARIO 4: According to Figure OS-1 – Mineral Resources Proposed C Street. However, according to the General Plan City of Riverside for decades. Further, the "Rock Product deposits are present)" or as "SZ (Scientific Resource are constructed by the second second</li></ul>	in area assoc would be <b>no in</b> urces, "Rock l FPEIR, mini ts" are not cl	iated with this mpact. Products" occur ng operations lassified as "Y	ur within the v have not been MRZ-2 (signif	vicinity of the active in the ficant mineral
Therefore, impacts associated with the loss of availability of region would be <b>less than significant</b> .				
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general				

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?				

### **11b. Response:** (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)

The GP 2025 FEIR determined that there are no specific areas with the City or Sphere area, which have locallyimportant 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.

**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**.

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**.

**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**.

*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**.

# 12. NOISE. Would the project result in: Image: Constraint of 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? Image: Constraint of the project result in:

#### 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 5.11-1 – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)

**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.

*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.

*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.

*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.

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

12b. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-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)

**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.

*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.

**SCENARIO 3:** Construction activities associated with this scenario could potentially increase the levels of groundborne 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

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
issue will not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: Similar to Scenario 3, construction activities the levels of ground-borne vibration or noise, but would no vibration or noise. Impacts would be less than significant.	ot generate or	ith this scenaries expose people	e to excessive	ground-borne
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
<ul> <li>12c. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Table 5.11-1 – Existing and Future Noise Contour Compar Title 7 – Noise Code)</li> <li>The proposed project would not create any new permanent s environment. However, a permanent increase in ambient patterns on roadways in the project vicinity.</li> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not increase ambient n exceed residential standards. There would be <b>no impact</b>.</li> <li>SCENARIO 2: Under this scenario, changes in circulation ambient noise levels in the project vicinity associated view significant and will be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: The extension of Overlook Parkway easterly increase in ambient noise levels associated with vehicular the and will be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 4: The extension of Overlook Parkway west permanent increase in ambient noise levels associated view</li> </ul>	Noise/Land C ison, Append stationary sour noise levels oise levels on on could result with vehicular over the arro raffic. This rep erly to Madis	Use Noise Con ix G – Noise I cces that would would result affected road affected road it in a substan r traffic. Imp byo could resul presents a <b>pot</b> son Avenue c	npatibility Cri Existing Cond I increase the from the cha way segments ntial permanen acts would b It in a substant entially signif ould result in	<i>iteria, FPEIR</i> <i>itions Report,</i> ambient noise nge in traffic to levels that nt increase in e <b>potentially</b> <i>ial permanent</i> <b>ficant impact</b> a substantial
<ul> <li>significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>12d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction I Conditions Report)</li> <li>SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not involve construct temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not involve construct temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the SCENARIO 3: This scenario could result in a substantial te the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significan SCENARIO 4: This scenario could result in a substantial te the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant for the project vicinity.</li> </ul>	ction, and wo project vicinit ction, and wo project vicinit emporary or pe t <b>impact</b> and emporary or pe	buld therefore ty. There would buld therefore ty. There would eriodic increas will be address eriodic increas	not result in d be <b>no impa</b> not result in d be <b>no impa</b> e in ambient r sed in the EIR. se in ambient r	a substantial ct. a substantial ct. noise levels in noise levels in
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>12e. Response: (Source: General Plan, Figure N-9 – March America)</li> </ul>				
The project site lies within the "airport environs" of March noise contours. The closest public airports to the project an Airport. The Riverside Municipal Airport is located appro Flabob Airport is located approximately three miles north outside both the Airport Influence Areas and airport noise co Flabob Airport. The project includes only roadway and	Air Reserve I rea are the Riv eximately two west of the ontours for bot	Base, but is no verside Munic miles west o project area. h the Riversid	ipal Airport as of the project The project as e Municipal A	nd the Flabob area, and the rea is located irport and the

	S (AND SUPPORTING RMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
	introduce any new residents or permanent employment wi expose people residing or working in the project area to exce		ct area; there	fore, the proje	ect would n	
	<b>SCENARIO 1:</b> Scenario 1 would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noi levels. There would be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.					
	<ul> <li>SCENARIO 2: Scenario 2 would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive levels. There would be <b>no impact</b>. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3 would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise</li> </ul>					
	There would be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be addressed <b>SCENARIO 4</b> : Scenario 4 would not expose people resid	in the EIR.	1 0			
	levels There would be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be add	dressed in the	EIR.			
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?				$\boxtimes$	
12f	<b>7. Response:</b> ( <i>Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airp</i> The closest private airstrip to the project area is the Lak southwest of the project area. Noise from aircraft operations area.	te Mathews A	Airport, locate	d approximat		
	SCENARIO 1: This Scenario would not expose people res levels associated with a private airstrip. There would be <b>no</b> if SCENARIO 2: This Scenario would not expose people res levels associated with a private airstrip. There would be <b>no</b> if SCENARIO 3: This Scenario would not expose people res levels associated with a private airstrip. There would be <b>no</b> if SCENARIO 4. This Scenario would not expose people res	impact. This i iding or work impact. This i iding or work impact. This i	ssue will not b ing in the pro ssue will not b ing in the pro ssue will not b	be addressed in ject area to ex- be addressed in ject area to ex- be addressed in	the EIR. accessive not the EIR. accessive not the EIR.	
	<b>SCENARIO 4:</b> This Scenario would not expose people res levels associated with a private airstrip. There would be <b>no</b> if					
	<b>DPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> ould the project result in:					
a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?					
13a	a. Response:			I		
	SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not induce substantial would be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be addressed in the	EIR.		-	·	
	<b>SCENARIO 2:</b> This scenario would not induce substantial would be <b>no impact</b> . This issue will not be addressed in the		rowth either o	lirectly or ind	irectly. Th	
	<b>SCENARIO 3:</b> This scenario would not induce substantial p Parkway easterly to Alessandro Boulevard would not ind objectives in the General Plan specifically account for the Arroyo (see Objectives LU-17 and CCM-4). Therefore, this Furthermore, almost all of the area surrounding the project (i.e., the connection would not provide a new road to an providing a more efficient route for residents that currently as Alessandro Boulevard, Arlington Avenue, and eventu <b>significant.</b> This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.	lirectly induce connection of was also accor area associat undeveloped reside near the	e population g f Overlook Pa punted for in p ed with this se area). Rather e project area	growth in an rkway over the opulation grow cenario has be to get to arteri	area. Seve ne Alessand wth estimat en develop ion would al roads, su	
	SCENARIO 4: This issue with not be addressed in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: This scenario would not directly induce housing or employment. Under Scenario 4, the easterly conn described under Scenario 3), also, the Proposed C Street wo connection to SR-91. Under Scenario 4, the Proposed C Str Street. The proposed alignment would bisect the Arlington I	ection of Ove uld be extende eet would cor	rlook Parkway ed west of Wa nnect from Wa	y would be im shington Stree shington Stree	plemented et to provid et to Madis	

	SUPPORTING ON SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	ial and primarily agrarian uses. The developm			et through th	is area cou
In 1979 by Pre. Avenue Zone to Subseq Sprawl, of Rive. amende propose services	ally induce growth and development within this agr by City of Riverside voters passed Proposition R, the serving the City of Riverside's Citrus and Agric "which calls for the preservation of agriculture of two specific areas of the City, including the Arling mently, in 1987, voters approved Measure C, enti- to Reduce Traffic Congestion, to Minimize Utility rside's Citrus and Agricultural Lands, its Scenic H d Proposition R by adding policies to promote agric and urban infrastructure into agricultural land area for additional growth to occur within the Greenber	e "Taxpayer's ultural Lands, hrough applicat ton Heights Greater (led "Citizens' Rate Increases ills, Ridgelines, culture. Policies from heavy tra s, except as nee	Its Unique H tion of the RA eenbelt. Rights Initiativ and to Facilit Arroyos and s established b ffic and minim eded for agricu	tills, Arroyos -5-Residentia te to Reduce ate Preservati Wildlife Areas y Measure C n hizing the extent tural purposes	and Victor I Agricultur Costly Urba on of the Ci C." Measure relevant to the ension of Ci S.
be repe in place	aled, which would require a vote by popular refere e, implementation of Scenario 4 would not result i gnificant. This issue will not be addressed in the E	endum. Therefo n indirect grow	re, with adequ	ate growth co	ntrols alrea
-	e substantial numbers of existing housin tating the construction of replacement housing the pre?				$\boxtimes$
SCENA be addr SCENA be addr SCENA roadwa EIR. SCENA roadwa the EIR		housing. There housing. There ng housing. Th ould be <b>no impa</b> ng housing. T would be <b>no im</b>	e would be <b>no</b> here is no hou <b>act</b> . This issue here is no hou	<b>impact</b> . This sing that exis will not be ad using that exis	issue will r sts within t dressed in t sts within t addressed
	e substantial numbers of people, necessitating the ction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$
SCENA issue w SCENA issue w SCENA within address SCENA	<ul> <li>hse: (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer, aer RIO 1: This scenario would not displace substan ill not be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>RIO 2: This scenario would not displace substan ill not be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>RIO 3: This scenario would not displace substan the roadway alignment associated with this scenared in the EIR.</li> <li>RIO 4: This scenario would not displace substates the roadway alignments associated with this scenared with this scenared the roadway alignments associated with this scenared wi</li></ul>	ial numbers of ial numbers of itial numbers o rio. There wou ntial numbers o	people. There f people. The ild be <b>no imp</b> of people. The	would be <b>no</b> re is no housi <b>act</b> . This issu re is no housi	<b>impact</b> . The state of the stat

	ES (AND SUPPORTING RMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	UBLIC SERVICES.				
	Vould the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts				
	ssociated with the provision of new or physically altered overnmental facilities, need for new or physically altered				
	overnmental facilities, the construction of which could cause				
	ignificant environmental impacts, in order to maintain				
	cceptable service ratios, response times or other performance				
0	bjectives for any of the public services:				
a.	1				$\boxtimes$
14	4a. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1; Esparza. Will Serve Lett	ter Response.	April 26, 201	1)	_
	The project does not propose any development that would in				
	Therefore, the project would not result in substantial adverse	e physical imp	pacts associate	d with the pro	vision of ne
	or physically altered government facilities. <i>SCENARIO 1:</i> This scenario would not result in the need fo	r now or như	i a altarad	rovernment fo	oilition Thou
	would be <b>no impact</b> ; however, the current status of services a				
	SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not result in the need fo	-			
	would be <b>no impact</b> . Services will be addressed in the EIR				
	need for new or physically altered government facilities. Th	ere would be	no impact. Se	ervices will be	addressed
	the EIR.			_	
	<i>SCENARIO 4:</i> This scenario would not result in the need fo would be <b>no impact</b> . Services will be addressed in the EIR.	r new or phys	sically altered g	government fa	cilities. The
b	Police protection?				$\boxtimes$
14	4b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Nei	ghborhood P	olicing Center	·s)	
	See response to 14a. <b>SCENARIO 1:</b> This scenario would not result in the need fo would be <b>no impact</b> . <b>SCENARIO 2:</b> This scenario would government facilities. There would be <b>no impact</b> . <b>SCENA</b> new or physically altered government facilities. There would result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities.	l not result i <b>RIO 3:</b> This be <b>no impac</b>	n the need for scenario would t. SCENARIO	new or phys d not result in <b>4:</b> This scena	ically altered the need for
c.	Schools?				$\square$
14	4c. Response:				
-	SCENARIO 1: Scenario 1 would not involve the addition	of housing	units resulting	in any stude	nt generatio
	Therefore, no impact related to demand for schools wou	-	-	•	-
	addressed in the EIR.				
	SCENARIO 2: Scenario 2 would not involve the addition	-	-	•	-
	Therefore, <b>no impact</b> related to demand for schools wou addressed in the EIR.				
	SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3 includes the connection of Ove				
	housing units resulting in any student generation. Therefor from this project. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR		related to den	nand for schoo	ols will resu
	SCENARIO 4: Scenario 4 includes the connection of Overla		along with con	struction of th	e Proposed
	Street but would not involve the addition of housing units res				
	related to demand for schools will result from this project. T				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
d	. Parks?				$\square$
14	<ul> <li>Id. Response:</li> <li>SCENARIO 1: Scenario 1 would not involve the addition of Therefore, no impact related to demand for parks would response.</li> </ul>				in populatio

	S (AND SUPPORTING RMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	in the EIR. SCENARIO 2: Scenario 2 would not involve the addition Therefore, <b>no impact</b> related to demand for parks would resin in the EIR. SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3 would not involve the addition Therefore, <b>no impact</b> related to demand for parks would resin in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: Scenario 4 would not involve the addition	sult from this s of housing uni sult from this s	ts resulting in Scenario. This ts resulting in Scenario. This	s issue will not any increase is issue will not	t be addressed in population t be addressed
	Therefore, <b>no impact</b> related to demand for parks would resin the EIR.			s issue will not	
e.	Other public facilities?			$\square$	
	which is maintained by the City of Riverside. The improve that together would complete the connection of Overlook I maintenance of the improvements following construction. less than significant effect on maintenance of public facilities	Parkway. The Therefore, in	City would b	e responsible of Scenario 3	for long-tern would have
	SCENARIO 4: This scenario would include improvement which is maintained by the City of Riverside. The improve that together would complete the easterly connection of C between Washington Street and Victoria Avenue. The City improvements following construction. Therefore, implement	nts to an exist rements includ Overlook Park would be res ntation of Sce	ing public roa e construction way, along wi ponsible for lo nario 4 would	adway, Overlo of a bridge an of a the Propo ong-term maint	ook Parkway nd fill sectio osed C Stree tenance of th
5. <b>R</b> F	<b>SCENARIO 4:</b> This scenario would include improvement which is maintained by the City of Riverside. The improve that together would complete the easterly connection of C between Washington Street and Victoria Avenue. The City improvements following construction. Therefore, impleme effect on maintenance of public facilities. This issue will not	nts to an exist rements includ Overlook Park would be res ntation of Sce	ing public roa e construction way, along wi ponsible for lo nario 4 would	adway, Overlo of a bridge an of a the Propo ong-term maint	ook Parkway nd fill sectio osed C Stree tenance of th
5. <b>RF</b> a.	SCENARIO 4: This scenario would include improvement which is maintained by the City of Riverside. The improve that together would complete the easterly connection of C between Washington Street and Victoria Avenue. The City improvements following construction. Therefore, implement	ts to an exist ements includ Overlook Park would be res ntation of Sce t be addressed	ing public roa e construction way, along wi ponsible for lo nario 4 would	adway, Overlo of a bridge an of a the Propo ong-term maint	ook Parkway nd fill sectio osed C Stree tenance of th
a.	<ul> <li>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would include improvement which is maintained by the City of Riverside. The improvement is maintained by the City of Riverside. The improvement is following construction. Therefore, impleme effect on maintenance of public facilities. This issue will note the easter of public facilities. This issue will note that regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</li> <li><b>a. Response:</b></li> <li>SCENARIO 1: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 1 of demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expect addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 2: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 2 of demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expect addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 2 of demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expect addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 3 i increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expect addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 3 i increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expect addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 4: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 4 inc Proposed C Street, no increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities in the Proposed C Street, no increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expected and the population increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expected addressed in the EIR.</li> </ul>	ts to an exist ements includ Overlook Park would be res ntation of Scent t be addressed regional park does not inclu ted. <b>No impa</b> regional park loes not inclu ted. <b>No impa</b> regional park ncludes only ies is expected regional park ludes only the	ing public roa e construction way, along wi ponsible for lo nario 4 would in the EIR. s or other recr de any new d cts would occu s or other recr de any new d cts would occu s or other recr the connection d. No impacts s or other recr connection of	adway, Overla of a bridge an ith a the Prop- ong-term maint have a <b>less tha</b> reational facili evelopment, n ur and this issu- reational facili evelopment, n ur and this issu- reational facili of Overlook would occur reational facili	bok Parkwa and fill section osed C Street tenance of the an significant ties general to increase ue will not be ties general to increase ue will not be ties general Parkway, read this issues ties general Parkway, read this issues ties general way and the
a.	<ul> <li>SCENARIO 4: This scenario would include improvement which is maintained by the City of Riverside. The improvement to together would complete the easterly connection of C between Washington Street and Victoria Avenue. The City improvements following construction. Therefore, impleme effect on maintenance of public facilities. This issue will not ECREATION.</li> <li>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?</li> <li><b>a. Response:</b></li> <li>SCENARIO 1: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 1 or demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expect addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 2: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 2 or demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expect addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 2 or demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expect addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 3 i increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expect addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 3 i increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expected addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 4: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 3 i increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities is expected addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 4: Increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 4 increase in demand for neighborhood or occurs due to population increase. Because Scenario 4</li></ul>	ts to an exist ements includ Overlook Park would be res ntation of Sce t be addressed regional park loes not inclu ted. <b>No impa</b> regional park loes not inclu ted. <b>No impa</b> regional park loes not inclu ted. <b>No impa</b>	ing public roa e construction way, along wi ponsible for lo nario 4 would in the EIR. s or other recr de any new d cts would occu s or other recr de any new d cts would occu s or other recr the connection d. No impacts s or other recr connection of	adway, Overla of a bridge an ith a the Prop- ong-term maint have a <b>less tha</b> reational facili evelopment, n ur and this issu- reational facili evelopment, n ur and this issu- reational facili of Overlook would occur reational facili	ties genera ties genera o increase ue will not ties genera ties genera ties genera o increase ue will not ties genera ties genera ties genera ties genera

. This issue we nal facility or . This issue we ection of Over ion or expanse ection of Over 1 facility or a	ill not be addr rlook Parkwa ion of recreati look Parkway ny new use, re	essed in the E equiring the c essed in the E y and does no ional facilities along with co equiring the co	IR. onstruction IR. ot include a onstruction onstruction
(LOS) (Typic ting and Typic rsection Impro OS E or F in	cal 2025), Tal cal Density So ovement Recon 2025, Table 5	ble 5.15-D – cenario Inters mmendations, 5.15K – Free	Existing a ection Lev Table 5.1 way Analy
n. This impa	ct is <b>potentia</b> l	lly significan	t and will
n. This impa	ct is <b>potentia</b> l	lly significan	t and will
$\boxtimes$			
	This issue we ection of Over ion or expanse ection of Over 1 facility or an This issue we - Master Pla (LOS) (Typic ting and Typi resection Impro OS E or F in Element Traff red plan, ordin n. This impact end plan, ordin	This issue will not be addr ection of Overlook Parkway ion or expansion of recreation of Overlook Parkway I facility or any new use, rec. This issue will not be addr - Master Plan of Roadway (LOS) (Typical 2025), Tail ting and Typical Density Section Improvement Record OS E or F in 2025, Table 5 Element Traffic Study and red plan, ordinance or police n. This impact is potential red plan, ordinance or police n. This impact is potential	Anster Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Fig (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – ting and Typical Density Scenario Inters resection Improvement Recommendations, OS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15K – Free Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study and Traffic Study and Traffic Study and Traff

	S (AND SUPPORTING RMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Exist of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Inter – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at La Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation E	rsection Impro OS E or F in	cal Density Sovement Reco 2025, Table S	mmendations, 5.15K – Free	Table 5.15 way Analys
	<i>SCAG's RTP</i> ) <i>SCENARIO 1:</i> This scenario could conflict with an applic <b>potentially significant</b> and will be analyzed further in the EI	R.	-		-
	SCENARIO 2: This scenario could conflict with an applic potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EI	R.	_		-
	SCENARIO 3: This scenario could conflict with an applic potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EI SCENARIO 4: This scenario could conflict with an applic	R. able congesti	-		-
	potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EI		I		
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?				$\boxtimes$
16c	c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – A March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Compre Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base The generated project will not result in impacts to give traffic	hensive Land (August 2005	d Use Plan ( 5)	(1999)and Air	• Installati
	The proposed project will not result in impacts to air traffic. Environs for the March Air Reserve Base, and a small porti- located within the Airport Environs for the Riverside Mun result in an increase in air traffic levels, nor would it involve	on of the Prop icipal Airpor	oosed C Street t. However, t	(under Scena the project itse	rio 4 only) elf would i
	SCENARIO 1: This scenario would not result in a change is issue will not be discussed in the EIR. SCENARIO 2: This scenario would not result in a change is	n air traffic p	atterns. No ir	npact would o	occur and t
	issue will not be discussed in the EIR. <i>SCENARIO 3:</i> This scenario would not result in a change is issue will not be discussed in the EIR.	n air traffic p	atterns. No ir	npact would o	occur and t
	<b>SCENARIO 4:</b> This scenario would not result in a change i issue will not be discussed in the EIR.	n air traffic p	atterns. No ir	npact would o	occur and t
d.	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
16d	I. Response: (Source: Project Site Plans, Lane Striping and				
	SCENARIO 1: This scenario does not include the construct occur.	tion of any ro	adway improv	ements; no in	npacts wor
	SCENARIO 2: This scenario does not include the construct occur.		• •		-
	<i>SCENARIO 3:</i> This scenario could Substantially increase dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. This impact is the EIR.	s potentially s	significant and	l will be analy	zed further
	<i>SCENARIO 4:</i> This scenario could Substantially increase dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. This impact is the EIR.				
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?	$\boxtimes$			
16e	e. <b>Response:</b> (Source: California Department of Transport Fire Code)	ation Highwa	y Design Ma	nual, Municip	al Code, a

	S (AND SUPPORTING RMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<ul> <li>SCENARIO 2: This scenario could result in inadequate en and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: This scenario could result in inadequate en and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</li> <li>SCENARIO 4: This scenario could result in inadequate en and will be analyzed further in the EIR.</li> </ul>	nergency acce	ss. This impac	et is <b>potential</b>	ly significant
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?				
	Mobility and Education Elements) SCENARIO 1: This scenario could conflict with adopted bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. This impact is <b>potentially si</b> SCENARIO 2: This scenario could conflict with adopted bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. This impact is <b>potentially si</b> SCENARIO 3: This scenario could conflict with adopted bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. This impact is <b>potentially si</b> SCENARIO 4: This scenario could conflict with adopted bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. This impact is <b>potentially si</b>	gnificant and policies, plat gnificant and policies, plat gnificant and policies, plat	will be analyz ns, or program will be analyz ns, or program will be analyz ns, or program	ed further in the ns regarding p ed further in the ns regarding p ed further in the ns regarding p	ne EIR. public transit, ne EIR. public transit, ne EIR. public transit,
	<b>TILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> 'ould the project result in:				
	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				$\square$
17:	a. Response: SCENARIO 1: The project does not include any new la therefore, it would not exceed wastewater treatment requiren Board. No impact would occur and this issue will not be ad	ments of the a	pplicable Regi		
	SCENARIO 2: The project does not include any new la therefore, it would not exceed wastewater treatment requirer Board. No impact would occur and this issue will not be ad SCENARIO 3: The project does not include any new la	nd use that h ments of the a dressed in the nd use that h	as the potenti pplicable Regi EIR. as the potenti	onal Water Qual to generate	uality Contro e wastewater
	therefore, it would not exceed wastewater treatment requirer Board. <b>No impact</b> would occur and this issue will not be ad <i>SCENARIO 4:</i> The project does not include any new la therefore, it would not exceed wastewater treatment requirer Board. <b>No impact</b> would occur and this issue will not be ad	dressed in the nd use that h ments of the a	EIR. as the potenti pplicable Regi	al to generate	e wastewater
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?				$\boxtimes$
	b. Response: SCENARIO 1: The project does not include any new land new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expans impacts associated with the construction of such facilities w SCENARIO 2: The project does not include any new land new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expans impacts associated with the construction of such facilities w SCENARIO 3: The project does not include any new land new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expans impacts associated with the construction of such facilities w scenario of such facilities or the expans impacts associated with the construction of such facilities w mental Initial Study 29	ion of existin ould occur. T use that wou ion of existin ould occur. T use that wou ion of existin	g facilities; th 'his issue will r ld require or r g facilities; th 'his issue will r ld require or r g facilities; th	erefore, <b>no er</b> not be addresse result in the co erefore, <b>no er</b> not be addresse result in the co erefore, <b>no er</b>	vironmenta ed in the EIR onstruction of vironmenta ed in the EIR onstruction o vironmenta

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
SCENARIO 4: The project does not include any new land new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expans impacts associated with the construction of such facilities w	ion of existin	g facilities; th	erefore, no er	nvironmental
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?				
<ul> <li>17c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Face SCENARIO 1: Scenario 1 would not require or result in the expansion of existing facilities. No impact would occur. SCENARIO 2: Scenario 2 would not require or result in the expansion of existing facilities. No impact would occur. SCENARIO 3: Scenario 3, which includes a bridge and fill also construct a continuation of the existing onsite storm dr be sized to accommodate projected post-construction flow discharging to the Santa Ana River. The extension of the existing in off-site this issue will not be discussed in the EIR. SCENARIO 4: Similar to Scenario 3, Scenario 4 includes drain facilities in the roadway which will be installed concurt the construction of the Proposed C Street. New storm drain in conjunction with the roadway extension. No off-site</li> </ul>	e construction e construction section for the ain system wi s and provide isting onsite s e impacts. Im the connection rrent with cons facilities wou	of new storm e connection o thin the roadw water quality torm drain sys pacts would b n of Overlook struction. In ac ald be construct	water drainag f Overlook Pa vay. The storn treatment ben tem would occ e <b>less than sig</b> and the exten ldition, Scenar cted within the	ge facilities or rkway, would n drain would nefits prior to cur within the <b>gnificant</b> , and sion of storm rio 4 proposes e right-of-way
<ul> <li>significant, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</li> <li>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>17d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-3 – Water Servic E – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR, 1 – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU includin SCENARIO 1: Scenario 1 would not include any land use would occur.</li> <li>SCENARIO 2: Scenario 2 would not include any land use would occur.</li> <li>SCENARIO 3: Roadway improvements associated with Sce Public Utilities (RPU) District. Existing domestic water lin the right-of-way. Because the project includes only road conjunction with irrigation for right-of-way landscaping Overlook Parkway is consistent with the City's General F roadway improvements has been accounted for in RPU's associated with water supply for Scenario 3 would be less t EIR.</li> </ul>	<i>Table 5.16-F – eg Water Relia</i> or improvem or improvem enario 3 are lo nes within Ove way improvez and would b Plan 2025, wat Urban Water	Projected Wa bility for 2023 ents necessitat ents necessitat cated within the rlook Parkwa ments, water e minimal. I ter demand as Management	ter Demand, 5, RPU Master ting water use ting water use he service area y would be ex demand woul Because the o sociated with t Plan. There	Table 5.16-Gr Plan) No impact No impacta of Riversidetended withind only be inconnection ofthe proposedfore, impacts
SCENARIO 4: Roadway improvements associated with Sce Existing domestic water lines in Overlook Parkway would be includes only roadway improvements, water demand would landscaping and would be minimal. In addition to water protection water supply would be constructed along the F Section 16.32.065. Because the eastern connection of Over with the City's General Plan, water demand associated accounted for in RPU's Urban Water Management Plan. Scenario 4 would be <b>less than significant</b> . This issue will n	e extended wi only be in co r transmission Proposed C St look Parkway with the pro Therefore, i	thin the right- njunction with a lines, public reet in accord and the Propo posed roadwa mpacts associa	of-way. Becau h irrigation for c fire hydrant lance with Mu osed C Street ny improveme	the project right-of-way s for the fire unicipal Code are consistent onts has been
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment				

	S (AND SUPPORTING MATION 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?				
17e	<b>. Response:</b> SCENARIO 1: This scenario does not include any new land new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of exist construction of such facilities would occur. This issue will n SCENARIO 2: This scenario does not include any new land new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of exist construction of such facilities would occur. This issue will n SCENARIO 3: This scenario does not include any new land new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of exist construction of such facilities or the expansion of exist construction of such facilities would occur. This issue will n	ing facilities; ot be addressed use that woring facilities; ot be addressed use that woring facilities; ot be addressed	therefore, <b>no</b> is ed in the EIR. ald require or therefore, <b>no</b> is ed in the EIR. ald require or therefore, <b>no</b> is ed in the EIR.	impacts assoc result in the co impacts assoc result in the co impacts assoc	iated with t onstruction iated with t onstruction iated with t
	SCENARIO 4: This scenario does not include any new land new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of exist construction of such facilities would occur. This issue will n	ing facilities;	therefore, no		
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			$\boxtimes$	
	operational waste would be generated. No impacts would of <i>SCENARIO 2:</i> Scenario 2 would not include any new operational waste would be generated. No impacts would of <i>SCENARIO 3:</i> Scenario 3 would not generate operational with the grading and construction phases of the project. Howe under the Public Resource Code requires that local jurisdict January 1, 2000. The City is currently achieving a 60% dive 2025 FEIR). The project would not result in soil export and landfill. Vegetation cleared during grading would be recyct grading waste from landfill disposal. The construction waster The City remains committed to continuing its existing waster.	construction ccur and this i waste; howeve ver, the Califi tion divert at ersion rate, we l, therefore, w led as green e would be pr	Therefore, ssue will not b er, solid waste fornia Integrate least 50% of a ell above state yould not resul waste. Thus, t imarily compri	no constructi e addressed in would be gen ed Waste Mar ill solid waste requirements t in the dispos he project wo	on-related the EIR. erated duri agement A generated (General Pl al of soil in
	that are available through the City. Contractors are required This can occur through recycling of materials at a certified separation or mixed source methods. Therefore, impacts <b>significant</b> . This issue will not be discussed in the EIR. <b>SCENARIO 4:</b> Refer to Scenario 3, above. Impacts associate	d to divert at d City of Riv associated so	least 50% of t erside recyclin olid waste dis	n efforts with heir construct ng facility usin posal would	ble materia the progra ion materia ng the sour be <b>less th</b>
g.	that are available through the City. Contractors are required This can occur through recycling of materials at a certified separation or mixed source methods. Therefore, impacts <b>significant</b> . This issue will not be discussed in the EIR.	d to divert at d City of Riv associated so	least 50% of t erside recyclin olid waste dis	n efforts with heir construct ng facility usin posal would	ble materia the progra ion materia ng the sou be <b>less th</b>

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 of wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to dro below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant of animal community, reduce the number or restrict the rang of a rare or an endangered plant or animal or elimina important examples of the major periods of Californ history or prehistory?	r p r e e			
<b>18a. Response:</b> ( <i>Source: Western Riverside County Multiple</i> <i>ALL SCENARIOS:</i> Scenarios 1 and 2 would not result therefore, would not degrade the quality of the environm species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop belo animal community; reduce the number or restrict the rang important examples of the major periods of California hi Scenarios 1 and 2. The proposed project sites associate supports suitable habitat for sensitive wildlife species. A historic and/or prehistoric resources. Therefore the analysi analysis shall be presented in an EIR.	in any impacts ent; substantial v self-sustainin e of a rare or a story or prehist l with roadway dditionally, the	s to biological ly reduce the l g levels; threa n endangered p ory. No impace / improvement e site has pote	or cultural r habitat of a fi aten to elimin plant or anima t would unde ts under Scen ential to conta	sh or wildlife ate a plant or al or eliminate r occur under arios 3 and 4 uin significant
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulative considerable" means that the incremental effects of 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)?	y a h			
<ul> <li>18b. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term E Program)</li> <li>ALL SCAENARIOS: The proposed project could potentia effects and the project's contribution to cumulative impact.</li> </ul>	lly result in cu	nulative impac	cts. Analysis	
c. Does the project have environmental effects which wi cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, eithe directly or indirectly?	er			
18c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental ALL SCENARIOS: The proposed project could potentially impacts from air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and not	result in subst	antial adverse	effects to hum	ans related to

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).