



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

Environmental Initial Study

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

1. AESTHETICS.

Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site may affect scenic views/scenic vistas because Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park, which is considered a notable scenic vista, is situated south of the Project site across Central Avenue. This potential impact is considered less than significant because the only direct visual impact to the public and the wilderness park will be the construction of one two-story apartment building between the fire station and the electric substation and one three-story building, which will have a maximum building height of 40 feet, at the corner of Central Avenue and Quail Run Road. This building will be located approximately five feet below the elevation of Central Avenue and Quail Run Road. Because these buildings will be visible from the Project site's 200-foot frontage along Central Avenue, they have been designed to be visually in scale with the existing two-story apartment buildings on the east side of Quail Run Road, which are at an elevation of 15 to 20 feet above the existing street grade. The remainder of the Project's apartment buildings to the rear (north) of these two buildings will be at lower elevations and not visible to the public from Central Avenue.

The Project includes two variances and one grading exception. P15-1081 Variance is requesting an exception to allow the development to include the design and construction of 3 story buildings for approximately 90% of the Project's buildings. P15-1080 Variance will allow for a reduced setback of 15 feet for a single story multiple family building (Building 5), which is located near the corner of Central Avenue and Quail Run Road. P15-1082 Grading Exception is requesting an exception to the regulations contained in Title 17 of the Riverside Municipal Code to accommodate the Project's proposed grading plan which is designed to protect existing biological habitats values on the Project site through avoidance and habitat restoration as discussed in the Project Description. The Project includes one building that will be at grade adjacent to Central Avenue and Quail Run Road, P15-1080 Variance and the grading exception will allow for the balance of the Project's proposed buildings to be three story in height, which due to topography and site design will be situated well below the grade of the adjacent streets and buildings. Because, the proposed pad elevations will be approximately 30 feet below the elevation at the Central Avenue and Quail Run Road, the proposed three story building will not be visible from Central Avenue or the existing apartment buildings south of Central Avenue. Therefore, granting the variances and grading exception will minimize aesthetics impacts by allowing the Project to be constructed and designed such that the setbacks of the proposed buildings are consistent with the setbacks of the existing apartment buildings along Central Avenue.

With regard to views of the Project site from future Project residents, as discussed in the Project Description, the Project is preserving an approximate 1.4 acre riparian/riverine area in the southwestern portion of the Project site and restoring approximately 6.2 acres in the borrow site (shown on Exhibit 4 as Temporary Impacts). To take advantage of these biological resources, the Project includes two raised viewing decks and space with interpretive signage explaining the viewshed and the significance of the biological resources for the enjoyment and education of residents and visitors. Because the Project has been designed to be visually in scale with surrounding development, incorporates viewing decks, and avoids and enhances on-site biological communities; direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts with regard to scenic vistas will be **less than significant**.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways, the City’s Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, Title 20 – Cultural Resources and, Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones - RC Zone, and Google Earth (2015))				

No Impact. The General Plan 2025 designates several roadways as Scenic Boulevards and Parkways in order to protect scenic resources and enhance the visual character of Riverside. The portion of Central Avenue fronting the proposed Project is not designated as a Locally or State designated Scenic or Special Boulevard and Parkway in the GP 2025. The Project has been designed to comply with the design guidelines contained in the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines and will generally be consistent with the development in the surrounding area. While there are rock outcroppings located within the Project site, many of the granitic boulder outcrops have been impacted, excavated and moved. The rock outcrops that remain on the Project site are in the most northern portion of the site, north of the borrow site (see Figure 4) in an area that will not be impacted. There are no historic buildings within view of this proposed Project. Because the Project will retain the existing rock outcrops, does not include any historic structures, and will avoid and restore habitat, there will be **no impact** to scenic resources directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Zoning Code, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)				

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is required to implement the General Plan 2025 goals and policies and is subject to Design Review for consistency with established Citywide Design Guidelines. The Project has been designed to be compatible with the surrounding area and will not degrade the existing visual character of the area. The Project includes the preservation (through avoidance) of approximately 1.4 acres of riparian/riverine habitat in addition to the enhancement of existing on-site biological habitat, through implementation of a grading plan that will expand the biological values of the Project site by re-contouring the borrow site to maximize the surface area and establish appropriate hydrology for the restoration/enhancement of approximately 6.2 acres of riparian/riverine habitat. The Project Applicant has been working with the RCA, and the Wildlife Agencies, and biologists and will develop a detailed restoration plan to mitigate for the loss of riparian/riverine resources at a 1:1 ratio. The restoration area will be placed in a conservation easement. As a result, there will be no net loss of riparian/riverine habitats, and the area will be biologically and probably visually superior to its current state. Due to all these factors, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the visual character and quality of the area are **less than significant**.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-2 – Mount Palomar Lighting Area, Title 19 – Article VIII – Chapter 19.556 – Lighting, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)				

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed 216 unit multiple family residential development will involve the introduction of new nighttime lighting typically associated with residential development. This lighting will be similar to that which already exists in the surrounding area and will not be considered significant. Nevertheless, all on-site lighting will be required to provide a minimum intensity of one foot-candle and a maximum intensity

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

of ten foot-candles at ground level throughout the areas serving the public and used for parking, with a ratio of average light to minimum light of four to one (4:1). The spill of light onto surrounding properties will be reduced through the inclusion of design features directing light downward or shielded and hooded, addressed through standard City conditions of approval, plan check, and permit procedures. Light poles shall not exceed 20 feet in height including the height of any concrete or other base material. Due to all these factors, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts with regard to creating a new source of substantial light or glare are **less than significant**.

2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

No Impact. The proposed Project is located in an urbanized area of the City that is already surrounded by multi-family residential, single family residential and public facilities. According to General Plan 2025 Figure OS-2, the proposed Project site is identified as “Other Land,” that is not designated Farmland on the Project site. There is no designated Farmland land immediately adjacent to the Project site. Designated Farmland is located approximately one-half mile to the northwest of the Project site; however, because the Project is essentially in-fill development, there is no Project component that will influence the conversion of this Farmland. For these reasons Project implementation will have **no direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts** on Farmland conversion.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

No Impact. The project site is within an urbanized area, not zoned for agricultural use, and is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. There is no property within proximity of the Project site under a Williamson Act contract. As such the proposed Project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or any applicable Williamson Act contracts. For these reasons Project implementation will have **no direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts** with regard to conflicts in this regard.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

No Impact. As stated in 2c above, the City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover. Therefore, **no impacts** will occur from this Project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

2e. Response: (Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table, Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones – RC Zone and RA-5 Zone and GIS Map – Forest Data)

No Impact. The Project site is surrounded by Urban and Built-Up Land and as such is in close proximity of multi-family residential, single family residential and public facilities. As stated in 2a, above, the proposed Project will not result in the conversion of Farmland. Although Farmland is located less than one-half mile from the Project site, Project implementation will not involve any changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses. The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover. Therefore, **no impacts** will occur from this Project directly, indirectly or cumulatively to conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or to the loss of forest land.

3. AIR QUALITY.

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

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

3a. Response: (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), GP 2025 FPEIR, Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Analysis)

Less Than Significant Impact. The City is located within the South Coast Air Basin ("the Basin"). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) prepares the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the

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

Basin. The AQMP sets forth a comprehensive program that will lead the Basin into compliance with all federal and state air quality standards. The AQMP's control measures and related emission reduction estimates are based upon emissions projections for a future development scenario derived from land use, population, and employment characteristics defined in consultation with local governments. Accordingly, if a project demonstrates compliance with local land use plans and/or population projections, then the AQMP would have taken into account such uses when it was developed.

The proposed Project includes a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from Open Space/Natural Resources (OS) to Medium High Density Residential (MHDR). Although this change is not consistent with the General Plan 2025 land uses which were incorporated in the AQMP, the Project will result in a substantial change for the following reasons. The GP 2025 FPEIR estimated a total of 127,692 dwelling units at build-out within the City's sphere under the "Typical Growth Scenario." The Project's increase of 216 units is less than a one percent increase. The GP 2025 FPEIR determined that implementation of the General Plan 2025 would generally meet attainment forecasts and attainment of the standards of the AQMP. The General Plan 2025 contains policies to promote mixed use, pedestrian-friendly communities that serve to reduce air pollutant emissions over time and this Project is consistent with these policies by offering a blend of residential and commercial uses, such as being in close proximity Canyon Crest Town Center. Because the proposed Project is consistent with air quality policies within the General Plan 2025 and the GP 2025 FPEIR determined the General Plan 2025 to be consistent with the AQMP, the proposed Project will not conflict or obstruct implementation of the AQMP. The Project will also be subject to the applicable control measures contained in the AQMP. Therefore, the Project will have **less than significant** impacts directly, indirectly, or cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

3b. Response: *(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared by WEBB on March 24, 2015)*

Less Than Significant Impact. Air quality impacts can be described in a short- and long-term perspective. Short-term impacts will occur during site grading and Project construction. Long-term air quality impacts will occur once the Project is in operation.

The Project's short-term and long-term emissions were evaluated using the CalEEMod version 2013.2.2 computer program (Appendix A – AQ/GHG Analysis). Project construction will be subject to SCAQMD Rule 403 for fugitive dust. The AQ/GHG Analysis evaluated Project compliance with Rule 403 by incorporating the option of watering the site three times daily. Short-term emissions consist of fugitive dust and other particulate matter, as well as exhaust emissions generated by construction-related vehicles. Maximum daily emissions from Project construction are summarized below and compared to the SCAQMD's daily regional thresholds: The maximum emissions from Project operation are summarized in the subsequent table and compared to the SCAQMD daily regional thresholds.

**ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING
INFORMATION SOURCES):**

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less Than
Significant
With
Mitigation
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No
Impact

CalEEMod MODEL RESULTS SHORT-TERM IMPACTS						
Activity	Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
SCAQMD Daily Thresholds Construction	75	100	550	150	150	55
Daily Project - Emissions Construction	55.63	75.08	50.45	0.08	6.66	4.71
Exceeds Y/N Threshold?	N	N	N	N	N	N

Source: Table 2, AQ/GHG Analysis

CalEEMod MODEL RESULTS LONG-TERM IMPACTS						
Activity	Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
SCAQMD Daily Thresholds Operation	55	55	550	150	150	55
Daily Project - Emissions Operational	11.58	20.90	87.35	0.17	11.83	3.45
Exceeds Y/N Threshold?	N	N	N	N	N	N

Source: Table 3 and 4, AQ/GHG Analysis

As shown in the tables above, the emissions from construction and operation of the Project are below the SCAQMD daily construction thresholds for all the criteria pollutants. In addition, the short-term emissions do not exceed SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds (LST) without mitigation, as contained in the AQ/GHG Analysis.

Therefore, the Project will have **less than significant** impacts directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.

- c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

3c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2012 Air Quality Management Plan)

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The portion of the South Coast Air Basin within which the Project is located is designated as a non-attainment area for ozone, PM-10, and PM-2.5 under both state and federal standards. Since the Project's emissions do not exceed the SCAQMD established thresholds of significance (see Response 3b, above); the Project's net increase in criteria pollutant emissions for which the Project region is non-attainment is not cumulatively considerable. Impacts will be **less than significant**.

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

3d. Response: (Source: Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared by WEBB on March 24, 2015)

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is located in a local neighborhood. As detailed in the AQ/GHG Analysis, the closest sensitive receptors are the residences adjacent to the local area streets and Project site.

Short-term emissions will only be generated in the Project area during construction of the Project and have been found to be less than significant (see Response 3b and Appendix A of this Initial Study). In addition, the Project will not result in carbon monoxide (CO) hot spots. Therefore, the Project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and impacts are considered **less than significant** directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

3e. Response: (Source: Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared by WEBB on March 24, 2015)

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project presents the potential for generation of objectionable odors in the form of diesel exhaust during construction, in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. Odors generated during construction will be short-term and will not result in a long-term odorous impact to the surrounding area. Recognizing the short-term duration and quantity of emissions in the Project area, the Project will result in **less than significant** impacts relating to objectionable odors directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

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

4a. Response: (Source: Focused Biological Assessment prepared by Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. (NRAI) on March 20, 2015)

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. No special-status plants were observed on site, and none are expected to occur on site due to lack of suitable habitat and the level of disturbance to the surrounding project area. The Project site is within the MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area 6 for Nevin's Barberry (*Berberis nevinii*), Smooth tarplant (*Centromadia pungens*), and Round-leaved filaree (*Erodium marcophyllum*). The MSHCP requires that focused surveys be conducted if potential habitat for these species is present. Nevin's Barberry was not observed during the biological field surveys and the site does not contain suitable habitat for this

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

species. Smooth tarplant was not observed and the Project site does not contain suitable alkaline soils to support this species. Round-leaved filaree was not observed and the Project site does not support the habitats preferred by this species. Because suitable habitat for MSHCP Criteria Area Species is not present on the Project site, focused surveys are not required. Riparian habitat is discussed in Response 4b), below. The Project site is not within a Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area.

There are several plant communities located on the Project site (refer to Exhibit 4). Coastal sage scrub forms the dominant scrub community and covers 90 percent, on the southern and northern hillsides of the Project site. The dominant species in this plant community are California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), desert brittlebush (*Encelia farinosa*), and California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*). The lower terraces of the Project site on either side of the Box Springs channel are occupied by alluvial fan scrub which is composed almost entirely of scalebroom (*Lepidospartum squamatum*). Other plant species in this include scattered stands of mulefat (*Baccharis salicifolia*), California buckwheat, Jimson weed (*Datura wrightii*) and castor bean (*Ricinus communis*). The eastern part of the upper terrace supports a mixed plant community of non-native species such as Peruvian pepper-tree (*Schinus molle*), eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* sp.) and native species such as tarragon (*Artemisia dracuncululus*) and cudweed aster (*Lessingia filaginifolia*). The western part of the upper terrace is dominated by a large dense stands of cattails (*Typha latifolia*) mulefat, and a willow (*Salix laevigata*) and mulefat stand.

With regard to special-status animal species, although no special-status animals were observed on site, such as the burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypogea*), the proposed Project site supports numerous tree and scrub habitats that provide foraging and nesting habitat for raptors and migratory birds. The Project site is within the MSHCP survey area for burrowing owl and focused surveys are required if suitable habitat for this species is present. Habitat was assessed over the entire Project site and an area up to 500 feet off-site, where accessible in accordance with the MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions. No burrows or sign of burrowing owl were observed and the Project site does not contain suitable nesting or foraging habitat.

Several bird species were observed on site which included common species such as house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*), house finch (*Carpodacus neomexicanus*) and northern mockingbird (*Mimus polygottos*). Other species observed included California quail (*Callipepla californica*), Say's phoebe (*Sayornis saya*), and northern rough-winged swallow (*Stelgidopteryx ruficollis*) (in migration).

Reptile species observed included side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana*) and western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*). Mammal species observed were limited to Botta's pocket gopher (*Gopherus bottae*), California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*) and Audubon's cottontail (*Sylvilagus audubonii*). No amphibian species were observed.

Because the Project site supports trees and shrubs, Project-related construction has the potential to directly and indirectly impact foraging for raptor, migratory birds and nesting habitats if conducted during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31). Compliance with the provisions of the MSHCP and adherence to mitigation measures **MM Bio 1** and **MM Bio 2** will reduce potential direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to foraging and nesting habitats for raptors and migratory birds to **less than significant**.

MM Bio 1: Site-preparation activities (removal of trees and vegetation) shall be avoided during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31), to the greatest extent possible. If site-preparation cannot be avoided during the nesting season, a breeding bird survey will be conducted to determine if nesting birds are present. Occupied nests will not be disturbed during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31) unless a qualified biologist verifies through non-invasive methods that either (a) the adult birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation; or

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

(b) the juveniles from the occupied nests are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival.

MM Bio 2: If the biologist is not able to verify one of the conditions identified in **MM BIO 1**, then no disturbance shall occur within 300 feet of non-raptor nests, and within 500 feet of raptor nests, during the breeding season so as to avoid abandonment of the young.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

4b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, and Focused Biological Assessment prepared by Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. (NRAI) on March 20, 2015, Determination of a Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation Plan by Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. (NRAI))

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The project site contains MSHCP riparian/riverine habitat. Specifically 3.98 acres of the Project site is occupied by willow-mulefat woodlands, 1.81 acres is occupied by mulefat scrub, 6.78 acres is occupied by alluvial fan scrub, and 2.0 acres is occupied by riverine non-vegetated habitat for a total of 14.57 acres of combined riparian vegetation and riverine habitats (see Exhibit 4). Excavation of the borrow area (see **Figure 4**) will temporarily impact 0.08 acres of the willow-mulefat woodlands, 0.29 acres of the mulefat scrub, 0.07 acres of riverine habitat, and 4.93 acres of alluvial fan scrub. The Project will result in permanent impacts to 0.81 acres of alluvial fan scrub. There will be no permanent impacts to willow-mulefat woodlands, mulefat scrub, and riverine habitat, because the Project has been designed to avoid these plant communities.

Volume I, Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP requires that projects develop avoidance alternatives, if feasible that will allow for full or partial avoidance of riparian/riverine areas. In situations where an avoidance alternative is not feasible and a practicable alternative is selected, the MSHCP requires a determination of biologically equivalent or superior preservation be made by the Permittee, which for this Project is the City of Riverside.

Because it is infeasible for the Project to fully avoid impacts to riparian vegetation and riverine habitats, a Determination of a Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) Plan was prepared and provided to the RCA and Wildlife Agencies for a 30-day review and response period. (A copy of the DBESP is included as Appendix B). As discussed in the Project Description section of this document, based on consultation and a site visit with the Wildlife Agencies, it was determined that the loss of riparian vegetation and riverine habitat could be mitigated on site at a 1:1 ratio as part of the borrow site rehabilitation. To that end, the borrow site area will be contoured and the Box Springs Channel widened to maximize surface area for the restoration of these habitats. (See **Exhibit 5 – Post Restoration Exhibit**.) Therefore, with implementation of mitigation measure **MM Bio 3**, which requires preparation, approval, and implementation of a detailed habitat restoration plan (as required by JPR # 15-04-15-01), and **MM Bio 4**, which requires recordation of a conservation easement, there

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

will be no net loss of riparian/riverine habitats. Although implementation of the Project may result in the loss of federal and state jurisdictional waters. These impacts will be reduced to less than significant because the Project will implement mitigation measure **MM Bio 5**. This mitigation measure requires the Project Applicant to obtain a permit from USACE under Section 404 of the CWA, a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration from CDF, and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) prior to the issuance of grading permits and adhere to the conditions placed on such permits. Therefore, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to special-status species will be reduced to **less than significant**.

MM Bio 3: As required by JPR # 15-04-15-01, prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall prepare a restoration plan and provide this plan to the City. The City shall provide the restoration plan to the Regional Conservation Authority, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service prior to issuance of grading permits. After completion of the restoration actions, the City shall be responsible for ensuring that the restoration actions are carried out and successful.

MM Bio 4: Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits the mitigation areas shall be placed under a conservation easement, dedicated to a Resource Conservation District or other approved mitigation entity. The City shall not issue any occupancy permits until they have been provided evidence that the conservation easement has been recorded.

MM Bio 5: Prior to any ground disturbing activities within jurisdictional waters, the Project Applicant shall obtain the necessary authorization from the regulatory agencies for proposed impacts to jurisdictional waters. Project-specific delineations may be required to determine the limits of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) jurisdiction. Impacts to jurisdictional waters shall require authorization by the corresponding regulatory agency. Authorization may include, but is not limited to, a Section 404 permit from the USACE, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB, and a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW. Project-specific impacts to jurisdictional waters shall be mitigated by the USACE, CDFW, and the RWQCB where applicable.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

4c. Response: *(Source: Focused Biological Assessment prepared by Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. (NRAI) on March 20, 2015)*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The Focused Biological Assessment and field survey for this Project revealed that the proposed Project site did not contain vernal pools, but did contain riparian/ riverine habitat and two features that contain the potential to be under the jurisdiction of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Board (RWQCB), and CDFW.

The Corps regulates discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. These watersheds include wetlands and non-wetland bodies of water that meet specific criteria. The lateral limit of Corps jurisdiction extends to the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) and to any wetland areas extending beyond the OHWM; thus, the maximum jurisdictional area is represented by the OHWM or wetland limit, whichever is

**ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING
INFORMATION SOURCES):**

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

greater. Corps regulatory jurisdiction pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act is founded on a connection or nexus between the water body in question and interstate (waterway) commerce. This connection may be direct, through a tributary system linking a stream channel with traditional navigable waters used in interstate or foreign commerce, or may be indirect, through a nexus identified in the Corps regulations. The Box Springs Canyon channel that traverses through the center of the property and may come under the jurisdiction of the Corps. Currently, flow along this channel is collected into a flood control basin. Prior to development of the region, it appears the Box Springs Canyon channel connected downstream to the Tequesquite Arroyo and from there to the Santa Ana River. The natural flow of the channel has been affected by the construction of the flood control basin, the Gage Canal, the reservoir in the agricultural fields of the University of California Riverside campus, and being placed in pipes underneath roads and development areas. However, it is likely the flow of water still connects to the Santa Ana River. The proposed project will not impact the Box Springs Canyon channel. The second, unnamed area on the property falls within the project development area. This area in the southwestern corner of the site is separate from the Box Springs Canyon drainage, but there is evidence of connection of overland flow. The cattail and mulefat-willow habitat within this area may be wetland habitat. The presence of this habitat, the mulefat and scale-broom plant community, and the evidence of overland flow indicate that this area has a significant nexus with the Box Springs Canyon drainage and therefore may meet the test of an isolated jurisdictional water.

The Corps has delegated the authority for use of 404 permits to each individual state. The use of a 404 permit in California is regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act regulations. The Board has authority to issue a 401 permit that allows the use of a 404 permit in the state, with the authority in the state being vested in regional offices known as Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB). Under the Porter-Cologne Act of 2003, the SWRCB has extended its responsibilities to include impacts to water quality from non-point source pollution. In addition, the SWRCB has the responsibility to require that projects address ground water and water quality issues, which would be evaluated as part of the geotechnical and hydrology studies. Their authority extends to all waters of the State (of California). Both the Box Springs Canyon channel and the second, unnamed area on the property would come under the jurisdiction of the RWQCB. The Box Springs Canyon channel provides seasonal water resources and some wildlife value, while the unnamed area provides substantial wildlife values.

CDFW) through provisions of the State of California Administrative Code, is empowered to issue agreements for any alteration of a river, stream or lake where fish or wildlife resources may adversely be affected. Streams (and rivers) are defined by the presence of a channel bed and banks, and at least an intermittent flow of water. Lateral limits of jurisdiction are not clearly defined, but generally include any riparian resources associated with a stream or lake; CDFW regulates wetland areas only to the extent that those wetlands are part of a river, stream or lake as defined by CDFW. The Box Springs Canyon channel on the property would come under the jurisdiction of the CDFW. The Box Springs Canyon channel is a recognized stream that seasonal water resources and some wildlife value. The unnamed area may not come under the CDFW. There is a sump area occupied by the willow trees, mulefat shrubs and cattails that would be considered riparian habitat, but no true streambed. However, its overland connection with the Box Springs Canyon channel and nearly continuous plant community cover may result in the CDFW claiming jurisdiction over this area. Scalebroom is one of several species that make up the alluvial fan scrub plant community. During the field meeting on January 12, the scalebroom-dominated plant community found on the upper terraces of the property was described by CDFW staff as meeting the test of an alluvial fan sage scrub plant community that would come under the jurisdiction of the CDFW.

Project construction will impact 5.74 acres of alluvial fan scrub. This impact is potentially significant but will be reduced to less than significant with implementation of **MM Bio 3** through **MM Bio 5**. In addition to further reduce Project impacts to jurisdictional waters **MM Bio 6** and **MM Bio 7** will implemented. Therefore, direct,

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

indirect, or cumulative impacts related to jurisdictional waters are considered **less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures**.

MM Bio 6: No trespass beyond that already delimited by construction limits shall occur into jurisdictional waters.

MM Bio 7: No drainage for subsequent development will be designed to flow or be directed into this area. All final project design flows will be directed into a formal site collection system. (As shown in Figure 7 – Project Drainage)

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

4d. Response: (Source: *Focused Biological Assessment prepared by Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. (NRAI) on March 20, 2015*)

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is not within an MSHCP designated corridor. Although the Box Springs Canyon channel intersects through the center of the Project and may provide some wildlife movement locally and possibly regionally upstream to Sycamore Canyon and the Box Springs Mountains. The downstream end is blocked by a residential and commercial development and probably no longer functions as a substantial wildlife corridor. Additionally, the Project area is already fragmented and divided by roads and housing. As a result, there are few native habitats left in the nearby surrounding areas, and impacts to wildlife movement and habitat fragmentation have already occurred. For these reasons direct, indirect, and cumulatively impacts with regard to wildlife movement will be **less than significant**.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

4e. Response: (Source: *MSHCP, Title 16 Section 16.72.040 – Establishing the Western Riverside County MSHCP Mitigation Fee, Title 16 Section 16.40.040 – Establishing a Threatened and Endangered Species Fees, City of Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, and Focused Biological Assessment prepared by Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. (NRAI) on March 20, 2015*)

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project is not subject to any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources other than the MSHCP. As the City is a permittee of the MSHCP, the Project is required to be consistent with the plan. The consistency of the proposed Project with the MSHCP is discussed in Response 4f below. The Project will not conflict with other local policies or ordinances protecting the biological resources and potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts will be **less than significant**.

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

4f. Response: (Source: *Focused Biological Assessment prepared by Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. (NRAI) on March 20, 2015*)

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The purpose of the MSHCP is to conserve habitat for selected species throughout western Riverside County. The MSHCP consists of a Criteria Area that assists in facilitating the process by which individual properties are evaluated for inclusion and subsequent conservation. In addition to Criteria Area requirements, the MSHCP requires consistency with Sections 6.1.2 (Protection of Species within Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools), 6.1.3 (Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species), 6.1.4 (Urban Wildlands Interface), 6.3.2 (Additional Survey Needs and Procedures), Appendix C (Standard Best Management Practices), and 7.5.3 (Construction Guidelines). The MSHCP serves as a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), pursuant to Section (a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), as well as the Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) under the State NCCP Act of 2001.

With regard to the MSHCP, the proposed Project is located partially within Subunit 2 of the Cities of Riverside and Norco Area Plan. Approximately 0.79 acres of the easternmost portion of the Project site is located within the extreme western boundary of Criteria Cell 719 (see **Figure 8 – MSHCP Criteria Cells**). The MSHCP identifies the conservation requirements for Cell 719 as contributing to the assembly of Proposed Constrained Linkage (PCL) 7 as shown in **Figure 8a – Additional MSHCP Criteria Cells**. Habitat to be conserved in Cell 719 is coastal sage scrub and grassland habitat to connect to coastal sage scrub habitat proposed for conservation in Cell 721 (in the Highgrove Area Plan to the east). The conservation goal for Cell 721 is 15%-25% of the Cell in the southeastern portion of the Cell. Because the Project site is at the extreme western portion of Cell 721 and not in proximity to the area slated for conservation, implementation of the Project will not affect PCL 7. Even through Project implementation will not affect the conservation goals for Cell 721, because a portion of the Project site is within an MSHCP designated Criteria Cell, Joint Project Review (JPR) was completed by the RCA (as previously discussed in the Project Description) to confirm consistency with the MSHCP. JPR #15-04-15-01 (dated August 17, 2015) concluded that the Project is consistent with both the Criteria and Other Plan requirements provided a detailed habitat restoration plan is prepared and approved (see **MM Bio 3**) a conservation easement is dedicated to an approved mitigation entity, and the City includes certain measures as conditions of Project approval. These measures, which are identified in the Project Description section of this document, are repeated below:

- Incorporate measures to control the quantity and quality of runoff from the site entering the MSHCP Conservation Area. In particular, measures shall be put in place to avoid discharge of untreated surface runoff from developed and paved areas into MSHCP Conservation Areas. According to the Habitat Assessment, the project shall incorporate measures, including measures required through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System requirements to ensure that the quantity and quality of runoff discharged to the MSHCP Conservation Area is not altered in an adverse way when compared to the existing conditions. Additionally, stormwater systems shall be designed to prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials, or other elements that might degrade or harm biological resources or ecosystem processes within the MSHCP Conservation Area. The project may use a variety of methods including natural detention basins, grass swales, or mechanical trapping devices.
- Land uses proposed in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area that use chemicals or generate bioproducts such as manure, which are potentially toxic or may adversely affect wildlife species, habitat or water quality shall incorporate measures to ensure that application of such chemicals does not result in discharge to the MSHCP Conservation Area. The greatest risk is from landscaping fertilization overspray and run-off. According to the Habitat Assessment, measures such as those employed to address drainage issues above shall be implemented.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Night lighting shall be directed away from the MSHCP Conservation Area to protect species within the MSHCP Conservation Area from direct night lighting. Shielding shall be incorporated in project designs to ensure ambient lighting in the MSHCP Conservation Area is not increased. According to the Habitat Assessment, the majority of the proposed project will be constructed during the daytime. No proposed lighting is included once construction is completed. Proposed noise generating land uses affecting the MSHCP Conservation Area shall incorporate setbacks, berms or walls to minimize the effects of noise on MSHCP Conservation Area resources pursuant to applicable rules, regulations and guidelines related to land use noise standards. According to the Habitat Assessment, noise would not exceed residential noise standards. Consider the invasive, non-native plant species listed in <i>Table 6-2</i> of the MSHCP in approving landscape plans to avoid the use of invasive species for the portions of the project that are adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area. Considerations in reviewing the applicability of this list shall include proximity of planting areas to the MSHCP Conservation Areas, species considered in the planting plans, resources being protected within the MSHCP Conservation Area and their relative sensitivity to invasion, and barriers to plant and seed dispersal, such as walls, topography and other features. Proposed land uses adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area shall incorporate barriers, where appropriate in individual project designs to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal trespass, or dumping into the MSHCP Conservation Areas. Such barriers may include native landscaping, rocks/boulders, fencing, walls, signage, and/or appropriate mechanisms. Manufactured slopes associated with the proposed site development shall not extend into the MSHCP Conservation Area. 				

The MSHCP *Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines* are intended to address indirect effects associated with locating development in proximity to a designated MSHCP Conservation Area. Because the Project site is partially within an MSHCP Criteria Cell, development in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area may result in edge effects with the potential to adversely affect biological resources within the Conservation Area. Through Project design, conditions of Project approval, and implementation of mitigation measures **MM BIO 1** through **MM BIO 7** any adverse indirect impacts on special-status resources within the Criteria Cell will be minimized. As such, the Project will be compliant with Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP.

As stated above the proposed Project does contain MSHCP riparian/riverine areas. However, the proposed Project is comprised of loamy and rocky soils; therefore, no evidence of ponding or areas suitable for ponding of vernal pools and associated species such as the Riverside fairy shrimp and vernal pool fairy shrimp are located within the Project boundary. No additional focused surveys or conservation are required. As such, the Project will be compliant with Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP

The Project is located within the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat in western Riverside County. The project is not located within a Core Reserve and additional focused surveys or conservation is not required. The Project Applicant will pay applicable MSHCP mitigation fees for the proposed Project. Therefore, as discussed above, because the Project will be compliant with the biological requirements of the MSHCP and Stephens' Kangaroo Rat HCP impacts are considered **less than significant**.

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

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

5a. Response: *(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas and Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code, and site specific Cultural Resources Survey prepared by CRM TECH, February 5, 2015)*

No Impact. A Cultural Resources Study, prepared by CRM TECH, for the proposed Project site indicated that 39 historical/archaeological sites and one isolate were previously recorded within a one-mile radius of the Project area. However, none of the 40 previously recorded cultural resources were located within or adjacent to the Project area, and none were discovered during the intensive field survey. Because no historical resources exist within or adjacent to the Project site, there will be **no impact** directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

5b. Response: *(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D – Cultural Resources Study and site specific Cultural Resources Survey prepared by CRM Tech, dated February 5, 2015)*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated for Unique Archaeological Resources.

Less Than significant With Mitigation Incorporated for Tribal Cultural Resources

Because the proposed Project involves a General Plan amendment and a change of zone, Senate Bill 18 (SB 18) Tribal Consultation Notification was initiated by the City of Riverside. Pursuant to SB 18, the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians did not object to the proposed Project, but requested further consultation with the Project Applicant and lead agency along with Native American monitoring by a Soboba representative during ground-disturbing activities. Additionally, the Pauma Band of Luiseno Indians did not object to the Project but recommended monitoring by both an archaeologist and Native American during Project construction and requested tribal review of the completed CEQA document.

Archeological Resources

As indicated in Response 5b, none of the 40 previously recorded cultural resources were located within or adjacent to the Project area and none were discovered during the intensive field survey conducted by CRM Tech. Even though there are no known unique archaeological on the Project site, in the unlikely event that archaeological resources are unearthed during Project construction, implementation of mitigation measure **MM CR 1**, which requires work to be stopped and any finds evaluated, will reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Therefore, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to unique archaeological resources are **less than significant with mitigation**.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), signed into law in 2014, amends CEQA and establishes new requirements for tribal notification and consultation. AB 52 applies to all projects for which a notice of preparation or notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration/mitigated negative

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

declaration is issued after July 1, 2015. AB 52 also broadly defines a new resource category of tribal cultural resources and establishes a more robust process for meaningful consultation that includes:

- prescribed notification and response timelines;
- consultation on alternatives, resource identification, significance determinations, impact evaluation, and mitigation measures; and
- documentation of all consultation efforts to support CEQA findings

On July 24, 2015, the City of Riverside provided written notification of the Project in accordance with AB 52 to all of the Native American tribes that requested to receive such notification. Of the tribes notified the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, and Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians requested formal government-to-government consultation under AB 52. The City of Riverside and the Project applicant met with the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians on August 11, 2015, the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians on September 1, 2015; and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians on September 16, 2015 per the requested AB 52 consultations. As a result of these consultations, the Project applicant entered into a Cultural Resources Treatment and Disposition Agreement with the all three tribes and promised to incorporate mitigation measures into the initial study similar to what the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians and Morongo Band of Mission Indians requested. Copies of non-confidential letters from the Tribes are included in Appendix C.

The following mitigation measures are substantially similar to what the Tribes requested during consultation.

MM CR 1: Prior to beginning construction the Project Applicant shall retain a City of Riverside qualified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify unknown archaeological resources. Any newly discovered cultural resource deposits shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation.

MM CR 2: At least 30 days prior to beginning Project construction, the Project Applicant shall contact the Pechanga Tribe, Soboba Tribe, and Morongo Tribe to notify the Tribes of grading, excavation, and the monitoring program and, if a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement has not been developed, to develop a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement between the Applicant and the Tribes. The Agreement shall address the treatment of known cultural resources, the designation, responsibilities, and participation of professional Native American Tribal monitors during grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities; project grading and development scheduling; terms of compensation for the monitors; and treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains discovered on the site.

MM CR 3: Prior to beginning Project grading, the Project Archaeologist shall file a pre-grading report with the City (if required) to document the proposed methodology for grading activity observation which will be determined in consultation with the Pechanga Tribe, Soboba Tribe, and Morongo Tribe. Said methodology shall include the requirement for a qualified archaeological monitor to be present and to have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities. In accordance with the agreement(s) required in **MM CR 2**, the archaeological monitor's authority to stop and redirect grading will be exercised in consultation the Pechanga Tribe, Soboba Tribe, and Morongo Tribe in order to evaluate the significance of any archaeological resources discovered on the property. Tribal and archaeological monitors shall be allowed to monitor all

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

grading, excavation, and groundbreaking activities, and shall also have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities.

MM CR 4: All cultural materials that are collected during the grading monitoring program and from any previous archeological studies or excavations on the project site, with the exception of sacred items, burial goods, and human remains, which will be addressed in the Treatment Agreement required in **MM CR 2** shall be tribally curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to a curation facility, which meets the standards set forth in 36 CFR Part 79 for federal repositories. All sacred sites, should they be encountered within the Project site, shall be avoided and preserved as the preferred mitigation, if feasible.

MM CR 5: If inadvertent discoveries of subsurface archaeological/cultural resources are discovered during grading, the developer, the project archaeologist, and the Tribe(s) shall assess the significance of such resources and shall meet and confer regarding the mitigation for such resources. Pursuant to Calif. Pub. Res. Code 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method for archaeological resources. If the developer, the project archaeologist, and the Tribe(s) cannot agree on the significance or the mitigation for such resources, these issues will be presented to the Community Development Director for decision. The Community Development Director shall make the determination based on the provisions of CEQA with respect to the archaeological resources and shall take into account the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the Tribe(s). Notwithstanding any other rights available under the law, the decision of the Community Development Director shall be appealable to the Planning Commission and/or City Council.

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

5c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3)

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. According to the Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS) website, the proposed Project site is located within a part of the City that is believed by the County of Riverside to have high potential sensitivity for paleontological resources. As a result, it is possible that paleontological resources could be discovered during earth moving activities. Nonetheless, in order to provide protection in the unlikely event that paleontological resources are unearthed during Project construction, mitigation measure **MM CR 6** will be implemented. Therefore, with regard to impacts to paleontological resources, direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts will be **less than significant with mitigation**.

MM CR 6: If any paleontological resources are exposed during Project related excavation, ground disturbance activities in the vicinity of the discovery shall be moved and a qualified paleontological resources specialist will be retained by the Project Applicant to evaluate the resources. If the find is determined to be significant, avoidance or other appropriate measures as identified by the paleontological resources specialist shall be implemented. Appropriate measures include a qualified paleontologist to be permitted to recover, evaluate, and curate the finds in accordance with the standards and guidelines of the City of Riverside and the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology.

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

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

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

Less Than Significant. The closest formal cemetery is the Olivewood Memorial Park, which is located approximately three miles to the west of the proposed Project. The Project-specific Cultural Resources Report identified that there was no evidence of any settlement or land development activities in the proposed Project area during the historic period. Lastly, none of the Native American tribes contacted identified the presence of burial sites. However, in the unlikely event that unknown human remains are uncovered during Project construction, California Health and Safety Code Sections 7052 and 7050.5 require the Riverside County Coroner's Office to be contacted within 24 hours and all work to be halted until a clearance is given by that office and any other involved agencies. Further, in that event, the Project Applicant will comply with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, as amended. Therefore, with adherence to existing laws and codes, impacts are considered **less than significant**.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

Would the project:

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

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Southern California is a seismically-active region that contains many earthquake faults. The proposed Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and no known earthquake faults traverse the site. Additionally, because the proposed Project will be in designed and construction compliance with the California Building Code regulations; direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts will be **less than significant**.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐
☐
☒
☐

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As stated above, Southern California is prone to seismic activity. Although the proposed Project site is not located within a fault zone and is not located within ½ mile of a fault; the Project site is still located within an area that is subject to strong ground shaking due to being in close proximity of the San Jacinto Fault Zone, which is located in the northeastern portion of the City and the Elsinore Fault Zone located in the southern portion of the City's Sphere of Influence. These faults have the potential to cause moderate to strong ground shaking. Nevertheless, the proposed Project would be required to implement all requirements of the current edition of the California Building Standard Code, applicable to the Project, which provides criteria for the seismic design of buildings. Therefore, with compliance with the California Building Standard Code direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts are **less than significant**.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6iii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)				

Less Than Significant Impact. Seismically-induced liquefaction is a phenomenon in which cyclic stress, produced by earthquake ground motion, create excess pore pressure in soils. The City of Riverside’s northern and western portions have shallow groundwater and loose alluvial strata which can cause liquefaction with the occurrence of strong ground shaking. According to the General Plan 2025 Liquefaction Zones Map – Figure PS-2, the proposed Project site is located in area identified as having low to moderate potential for liquefaction. Compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts related to seismic failure, including liquefaction will be **less than significant**.

iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6iv. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code)				

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site is not located within an area that is prone to landslides; however, if land sliding was to occur it would be surficial due to steepness of slopes. Although deep seated sliding is unlikely, the average existing slope of the Project site is 13.2 percent; thus, an exception to the City’s Municipal Code regarding grading is required. As part of the construction permitting process and reflected in the City’s Subdivision Code (Section 18.090.050), completed reports of soil conditions at specific construction sites are required to identify potentially unsuitable soil conditions including landslides, liquefaction and subsidence. The reports must be written by a registered soil professional, and measures to eliminate inappropriate soil conditions must be applied. The design foundation support must conform to the analysis and implementation criteria described in CBC Chapter 15. With implementation of mitigation measure **MM GEO 1**, which requires the City approve a geotechnical report and the Project implement the recommendations in said report, impacts associated with landslides will be **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

MM Geo 1: Prior to issuance of a grading permit for the Project, a soils or geotechnical report that identifies the potential for landslides on the Project site and provides recommendations for grading and foundation support shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. The Project applicant shall implement all recommendations in the approved report.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code)				

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities have the potential to result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. However, erosion will be addressed through the implementation of existing State and Federal requirements, and the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which will identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) to address soil erosion. Through compliance with these standard regulatory requirements, the project is not anticipated to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil during construction and no additional mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, as discussed in the Project

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Description, the Project will be restoring habitat that will be impacted by Project construction. To accommodate habitat restoration, the floor of the project site will be recontoured to allow flows across the site to spread out and appropriate plant species will be planted, which will reduce soil erosion in the post-Project condition. Through regulatory compliance and implementation of the restoration plan required in mitigation measure **MM Bio 3**, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts will be **less than significant**.

c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

6c. Response: *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Figure 5.6-1 - Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project is located on two geologic units. However, these geologic units are not layered and as such are not susceptible to sliding. Additionally, the Project is located on soil that is unstable and will not cause soil to become unstable. Distribution of the geologic units is as follows: the east side of the Project site is granitic bedrock; and the west side of the Project site is made up of older alluvium. The older alluvium is dense and indurated and the granitic bedrock is dense to very dense. Based on earlier work at the site, relative compaction in this native is close to 90% in natural condition. The older alluvium is sedimentary terrain but does not have a defined layer. Because this alluvium is not layered it is not considered deep seated and has an unlikely chance of sliding; however, if sliding does occur in this soil, it would be surficial due to saturation from outside sources and the steepness of terrain. The granitic bedrock is igneous rock and is not susceptible to deep seated landsliding. Through compliance with the conditions imposed on the Project as part of the grading exception and policies contained in General Plan 2025, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts related to geologic conditions will be reduced to **less than significant**.

d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

6d. Response: *(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Figure 5.6-5 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, and California Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code)*

Less Than Significant Impact. Expansive soils have a significant amount of clay particles or other minerals that have the ability to give up water (shrink) or take on water (swell). Fine grained soils, such as silts and clays, may contain variable amounts of expansive clay materials. When these soils swell, the change in volume exerts significant pressures on loads that are placed on the vertical face of a foundation. This shrink-swell movement can adversely affect building foundations, often causing them to crack or shift. The soils types associated at the Project site are: Buren fine sandy loam, Cieneba sandy loam, Hanford coarse sandy loam, Terrace escarpments, and Tujunga loamy sand. All of the soils associated with the Project site are considered to be well drained soils. According to General Plan 2025 Final Programmatic EIR Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential – Figure 5.6-5-2, none of the soils types located within the Project site have a high shrink swell potential. A soils and geotechnical report will be required upon submittal of construction plans to the City Building and Safety Department. Compliance with recommendations of the soils report and the applicable provisions Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 16.08.020 The Uniform Building Code will reduce potential direct, indirect, and cumulative hazards related to soil expansion to a **less than significant**.

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

- e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

6e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types)

No Impact. The proposed Project will be served by a sewer system and no septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems will be required. There will be no **impacts**.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

Would the project:

- a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

7a. Response: (Source: AQ/GHG Analysis prepared by WEBB on March 24, 2015)

Less Than Significant Impact. The AQ/GHG Analysis evaluated the Project's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the Project and indicates that an estimated total of 2,974.74 metric tons per year of carbon dioxide (CO₂) equivalents (MTCO₂E) will occur from the Project, which includes construction-related emissions amortized over a typical project life of 30 years. The total GHG emissions are below the SCAQMD recommended screening level of 3,000 MTCO₂E/yr for residential projects.

Therefore, the proposed Project will not generate GHG emissions and the impact is considered to be **less than significant** directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

7b. Response: (Source: Project Description)

Less Than Significant Impact. As stated in Response 7a, above, the Project's GHG emissions are below the SCAQMD recommended screening threshold and will not result in substantial amount of GHG emissions. Further, the Project will be subject to a variety of measures that reduce GHG emissions, including, but not limited to the current 2013 Title 24 (Building Energy Efficiency Standards), 2013 CalGreen Code (Green Building Standards Code), and measures being implemented under the California Air Resources Board Climate Change Scoping Plan. Therefore, the Project will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation for the reduction in GHG emissions. Impacts are **less than significant**.

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

8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

8a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, Riverside Fire Department EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM's Strategic Plan)

Less Than Significant Impact. The transportation and storage of hazardous materials, such as fuels, cleaning solvents or pesticides that could occur in conjunction with project construction or operations could result in accidental spills, leaks toxic releases, fires or explosions. Hazardous material transport, storage and response to upsets or accidents are primarily subject to federal regulation by the Department of Transportation (DOT) Office of Hazardous Materials Safety in accordance with Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations (Hazardous Materials Transportation Act). California regulations applicable to Hazardous material transport, storage and response to upsets or accidents are codified in Title 13, (motor vehicles) Title 8 (Cal/OSHA), Title 22 (Health and Safety Code), Title 26 (Toxics) of the California Code of Regulations, Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code (Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory) and the California Building Code. Compliance with all applicable federal and state laws related to the transportation, storage and response to upsets or accidents that may involve hazardous materials would reduce the likelihood and severity of upsets and accidents during transit and storage, and potential impacts will be **less than significant**.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

8b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7 A – D, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, City of Riverside's EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM's Strategic Plan and)

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project does not involve the use of any hazardous materials. Therefore, direct indirect and cumulative **impacts are less than significant**.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

No Impact. The proposed Project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school site. The nearest school is Oxford Riverside Academy, located at 5225 Canyon Crest Drive, Suite 400 in the City of Riverside which is approximately a half of mile to the northwest of the Project site. Therefore, **no impacts** are anticipated.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8d. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-5 – Hazardous Waste Sites, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7-A – CERCLIS Facility Information, Figure 5.7-B – Regulated Facilities in TRI Information and 5.7-C – DTSC EnviroStor Database Listed Sites)</i>				

Less Than Significant Impact. The California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database was reviewed for hazardous material sites. The proposed Project site does not appear on any hazardous material site list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. However, the project site is located less than a mile from DTSC’s hazardous waste site 33890001- University of California Riverside, located at 1060 Pennsylvania Avenue, Riverside CA. Site 33890001 is located in the Agricultural Operation Yard of the University and is regulated by DTSC’s Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program, and has land use restrictions for future development which include: prohibition of day care center or hospital; no excavation or activities which disturb the soil at any depth without approval; only extraction of groundwater for site remediation permitted; prohibition of the raising food; no groundwater extraction at any depth without approval; land use covenant; maintenance of groundwater monitoring, notifications prior to subsurface work. Despite the proposed Project being located less than a mile from the listed hazardous site 33890001, the proposed Project footprint exhibits no evidence of recognized environmental conditions related to the hazardous site that would prohibit Project development or cause environmental impacts from Project construction or operation. Therefore, the impacts from the Project being located in close proximity to a hazardous site are **less than significant**.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8e. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP and March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan dated November 13, 2014)</i>				

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project site is located within the Influence Area of March Air Reserve Base, and is located within an Airport Compatibility Zone E of the March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; therefore, the proposed Project is subject to development review by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). Compatibility Zones set forth land use compatibility guidelines, maximum population density requirements and maximum coverage requirements. Zone E is established at 14,000 feet from the runway centerline and is equivalent to the outer limits of the civilian airport conical surface. Compatibility Zone E allows for residential development and has no restrictions on density. Neither residential density nor non-residential intensity is limited within Zone E, pursuant to the Countywide Policies section of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The site is located outside the 55 dB(A) CNEL contour from March Air Reserve Base, therefore no special measures to mitigate aircraft noise are required at the project site. ALUC is concerned with potential impacts related to (1) exposure to aircraft noise, (2) land use safety with respect both to people on the ground and the occupants of aircraft, (3) protection of airport airspace; and (4) general concerns related to aircraft overflights.

**ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING
INFORMATION SOURCES):**

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

On May 14, 2015 the Commission found the Project's General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone, and Site Plan Review consistent, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Any outdoor lighting that is installed shall be hooded or shielded so as to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. Outdoor lighting shall be downward facing.
- 2) The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area. (Such uses include landscaping utilizing water features, aquaculture, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, artificial marshes, wastewater management facilities, composting operations, construction and demolition debris facilities, fly ash disposal, and incinerators.)
 - d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
- 3) The attached notice¹ shall be provided to all potential purchasers of the property and tenants of the buildings, and shall be recorded as a deed notice.
- 4) Any ground-level or aboveground water retention or detention basin or facilities shall be designed so as to provide for a detention period for the design storm that does not exceed 48 hours and to remain totally dry between rainfalls. Vegetation in and around such facilities that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be incompatible with airport operations shall not be utilized in project landscaping. Trees shall be spaced so as to prevent large expanses of contiguous canopy, when mature.
- 5) March Air Reserve Base must be notified of any land use having an electromagnetic radiation component to assess whether a potential conflict with Air Base radio communications could result. Sources of electromagnetic radiation include radio wave transmission in conjunction with remote equipment inclusive of irrigation controllers, access gates, etc.

The consistency determination allows the City to take action on the project, without having to proceed through the 45 day overrule process or a supermajority Council vote. The above conditions of approval are recommended by ALUC should the City decide to approve the Project. Given ALUC's determination that the Project is consistent with 2014 March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, impacts with regard to safety hazards for people residing or working in the area are **less than significant** directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.

¹ The notice attached to the ALUC staff report and Minute Order is included on the page following the References at the end of this Initial Study..

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP)				

No Impact. The proposed Project is not located within the proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip. As a result, the proposed Project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip. Therefore, **no impacts** are anticipated.

g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8g. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.7 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, and OEM’s Strategic Plan)				

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project will be served by Central Avenue, which is a fully improved street consistent with Fire Department standards. No street closures are anticipated; The Project does not include any component that will interfere or impede with any emergency response evacuation plan. Therefore the Project will have a **less than significant** impact directly, indirectly, and cumulatively.

h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Hazard Areas, GIS Map Layer VHFSZ 2010, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002, Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1/Part 2 and OEM’s Strategic Plan)				

No Impact. According to General Plan 2025 Fire Hazard Areas Figure PS-7, the proposed Project is defined as hills and canyons. These areas can pose the greatest potential for wildfire if located in areas of dense and dry vegetation. Additionally, the proposed Project is surrounded by urbanized built up environment and is in close proximity to a Very High Fire Severity Zone (VHFSZ) to the northeast. As a result the applicant prepared and submitted a fire plan to the City of Riverside, which showcased fire lane/fire access, all residential buildings equipped with a 13R fire sprinkler, and the club house and leasing office equipped with full 13 sprinkler systems. Additionally, all new construction is required to comply with the California Fire and Building Codes and City Fire Department staff will review the design and will require emergency vehicle access, per City standards. For these reasons, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts with regard to risk from wildland fires will be **less than significant**.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.

Would the project:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Beneficial Uses Receiving Water and Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Alfa Investments on August 2014)				

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project is located within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Board. The SARWQCB sets water quality standards for all ground and surface waters within its region. Water quality standards are defined under the Clean Water Act (CWA) to include both the beneficial uses of specific water bodies and the levels of water quality that must be met and maintained to protect those uses (water quality objectives). Water quality standards for all ground and surface waters overseen by the SARWQCB are documented in the Basin Plan. Water quality standards are attained when designated beneficial uses are achieved and water quality objectives are being met. The regulatory program of the SARWQCB is designed to minimize and control discharges to surface and groundwater within the region, largely through permitting, such that water quality standards are effectively attained.

A preliminary Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan for Quail Run Apartments dated August 2014 (the WQMP) incorporates Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that water quality standards are not violated. The proposed Project includes site design source controls and bioretention/biotreatment BMPs and has been designed with the intent to minimize impervious/hardscape surfaces to the Project site and to include large landscaped areas that will be used for infiltration. Additional runoff from the Project site will be routed to a pervious landscaped area or infiltration basins where it will infiltrate into the ground. This will ensure that no water will be discharge into the storm drain.

During the construction phase, a final approved WQMP will be required for the proposed Project, as well as issuance of grading permits for the proposed project. The applicant will need to file a Notice of Intent with the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) indicating that the proposed Project's construction activities would be in compliance with the Construction Activities General Permit (State Water Resources Board Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002). The primary condition of the Construction Activities General Permit is preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that includes BMPs to address soil erosion during construction. Through compliance with these standard regulatory requirements, the Project will not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction

Through compliance with the NPDES General Construction Permit and implementation of the Project-specific WQMP, water quality standards and waste discharge requirements will not be violated by the proposed Project. Therefore, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts are **less than significant**.

b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

9b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, Table PF-3 – Western Municipal Water District Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), RPU Map of Water Supply Basins, RPU Urban Water Management Plan)

Less Than Significant Impact. The domestic and irrigation water will be supplied to the proposed Project site by Riverside Public Utilities Service. The proposed Project is required to connect to the City's sewer system and comply with all NPDES and WQMP requirements that will ensure that the proposed Project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Therefore, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts are **less than significant**.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9c. Response: <i>(Source: Preliminary grading plan, and Project Specific – Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Alfa Investments on August 2014)</i> Less Than Significant Impact. The Box Springs Canyon channel runs through the center of the Project site and connects to the flood control basin adjacent to the northwest boundary of the site, which is owned by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD). The natural flow of the channel has been affected by previous construction of the flood control basin, the Gage Canal, the reservoir in the agricultural fields of the University of California Riverside campus, and being placed in pipes underneath roads and development. However, it is believed that the flow of water from this channel still connects to the Santa Ana River. In addition, to the Box Springs Canyon channel, there is a second, unnamed area, located at the southwest corner of the Project site that showcases evidence of overland flow and has the presence of wetland habitat. The Project has been designed to follow the existing flow patterns throughout the site and maintain the same area of flow post-construction. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project is required to prepare a SWPPP pursuant to the General Construction Permit NPDES No. CAS000002, Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ that incorporates BMPs to minimize the potential for construction related runoff and erosion. Thus, the Project will not substantially alter an existing drainage pattern, including alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner resulting in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts are less than significant .				
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9d. Response: <i>(Source: Preliminary grading plan, and Project Specific – Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Alfa Investments on August 2014)</i> Less Than Significant Impact. For purposes of water quality and drainage, the Preliminary WQMP has defined six Drainage Management Areas (DMA) based on the proposed grades and surface types. Runoff from DMA 1 will be routed around the proposed apartment buildings via various swales and will eventually be intercepted by a catch basin where it will be piped down the proposed 2:1 slope (to avoid erosion of the slope) and into Infiltration Basin 1. Runoff from DMA 2 will also be routed around the proposed apartment buildings via various swales and will eventually be intercepted by a catch basin where it will be piped down the proposed 2:1 slope into Infiltration Basin 2. DMA 6 will also flow to Infiltration Basin 2. Runoff from DMA 4 and DMA 5 will flow overland to the flat impervious area below the pad area to infiltrate naturally. With implementation of the WQMP, impacts will be less than significant .				
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

9e. **Response:** *(Source: Preliminary Grading Plan, and Project Specific – Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Alfa Investments on August 2014)*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project will capture runoff in two infiltration basins prior to any discharge into the existing facilities with adequate capacity. Therefore **impacts will be less than significant.**

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

9f. **Response:** *(Source: Project Specific – Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Alfa Investments on August 2014)*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is over one acre in size and is required to have coverage under the State's General Permit for Construction Activities (SWPPP). As stated in the Permit, during and after construction, best management practices (BMPs) will be implemented to reduce/eliminate adverse water quality impacts resulting from development. The Project Applicant prepared a Preliminary Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan in accordance with City of Riverside requirements and its Municipal Separate Storm System (MS4) permit. The proposed development will increase the amount of impervious surface area in the City. This impervious area includes paved parking, areas, sidewalks, roadways, and building rooftops; all sources of runoff that may carry pollutants and therefore has the potential to degrade water quality. The Project identified pathogens as the pollutant of concern. As such, appropriate site design, source control and treatment control best management practices were incorporated into the Project design to fully address pathogens and other potential and expected pollutants that are generally associated with residential land uses, such as trash and debris, oil etc. Final BMPs will be required prior to grading permit issuance. The purpose of this requirement is to insure treatment BMPs are installed/constructed as part of the Project so that pollutants generated by the Project will be treated in perpetuity. Therefore, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts are considered **less than significant.**

g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

9g. **Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Map 06065C0729G)*

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Response 9i, the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0729G Effective Date August 28, 2008) and Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard areas of the GP 2025 Program FPEIR indicate that the proposed Project site is located in a 100-year (1% annual chance of flood) flood hazard area. The City Municipal Code, Title 16 Building and Construction, Chapter 16.18 Flood Hazard Area and Implementation of National Flood Insurance Program, Section 16.18.050 requires new construction located within a 100-year flood zone to mitigate flood hazards by including on-site drainage, anchoring methods, to prevent floating structures, elevating buildings above flood levels, and flood proofing, which requires the building to be inspected and certified by a professional engineer, surveyor or building inspector.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has not established base flood elevation for the flood hazard area in which the proposed Project is located. The top of the spillway, which is the highest elevation any floodwaters would reach before spilling over inundating off-site areas, for the RCFCWCD-owned dam west of the Project site is 1,132.0 feet. The Project's lowest building pad elevation is 1,136.0 feet, which is above the reasonably expected highest flood level.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The Applicant is currently processing a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR-F) with FEMA. A CLOMR-F is a letter from FEMA stating that a parcel of land or proposed structure that will be elevated by fill would not be inundated by the base flood if fill is placed on the parcel or the structure is built as proposed. Furthermore, it is FEMA's comment on a proposed project that would, upon construction, affect the hydrologic or hydraulic characteristics of a flooding source and thus result in the modification of the existing regulatory floodway, the effective Base Flood Elevations (BFEs), or the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA); however, the letter does not revise an effective National Flood Insurance Program map (NFIP), but instead indicates whether the project, if built as proposed would be recognized by FEMA. Therefore, the CLOMAR process does not result in a map change until after the Project site is graded, and a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR-R) is requested from FEMA. A LOMR-R is a letter from FEMA stating that an existing structure or parcel of land that has been elevated by fill would not be inundated by the base flood.

A beneficial impact resulting from the Project's proposed grading will be to provide flood protection to Canyon Crest Fire Station No 14, which is adjacent to the southwest portion of the Project site. In the existing condition, during heavy rains the north portion of the Fire Station site is subject to flooding. The Project's proposed grading plan and basin will alleviate future flooding of the Fire Station.

For the reasons set forth above, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts with regard to housing within a 100-year flood hazard area will be **less than significant**.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

9h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Map 06065C0729G)

Less Than Significant Impact. Project implementation will result in the construction of apartment building, internal road, and parking lots within a 100-year flood hazard. In the post-project condition, the lowest building pad will be at an elevation of 1,136.0, which is four feet higher than the top of the dam spillway, which has an elevation of 1,132.0. The Applicant is currently processing a CLOMR-F and will request a LOMR-F once grading is complete. The Project will impede flood flows from inundating Canyon Crest Fire Station No. 14 by which is a beneficial impact. For these reasons, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts are considered **less than significant**.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

9i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps 06065C0729G)

Less Than Significant Impact. According to General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, the proposed Project is located within close proximity of Box Springs Dam. As discussed in Response 9g, the Project site is within a 100-year flood zone. However, the grading has been designed such that the lowest building pad is approximately 2 feet higher than the spillway for the dam. The proposed Project has been designed to include infiltration basins; however, larger long duration storm events which generate a quantity of runoff which exceeds the capacity of the basins will flow overland beyond the Project boundary and into the RCFCWCD detention basin. The storage capacity of that basin will be increased and the basin capacity, access and navigation through

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

RCFCWCD's "inundation easement" are being coordinated with RCFCWCD. For these reasons direct, indirect, and cumulative, impacts are considered **less than significant**.

j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

No Impact. The proposed Project is not in an area subject to seiches, tsunami, or mudflows. Flows from the Project site currently flow along the Box Springs Canyon channel and are collected in a flood control basin which is maintained by the Riverside County Flood Control District. Periodically, large storms have been known to transport debris and sediment from the four square mile watershed where it is deposited to the lowest portion of the Project site. Nevertheless debris is regularly removed to maintain the level of the basin during large storm events. For these reasons direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts will be **less than significant**.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

No Impact. The Project site is currently vacant and can be accessed via Central Avenue. Surrounding land uses include vacant land, single-family residential, and multi-family residential. Implementation of the Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community, including a low-income or minority community as the Project does not propose to eliminate any existing roadways or create barriers to accessing existing development. Therefore, **no impacts** are anticipated

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project involves a General Plan Amendment to amend the land use designation of 13.3 acres of the 30.9 acre Project site from Open Space/Natural Resources to Medium High Density Residential (MHDR), an amendment to Title 19 of the Riverside Municipal Code (Zoning Code) to rezone 12.7 acres from Public Facilities to R-3-3000 Multi-Family Residential and 0.6 acres from R-1-700 Single Family Residential and Public Facility (PF) to R-3-3000. Because the Project site is located in close proximity to existing multi-family residential developments, it would continue the development pattern of multi-family residential uses along Central Avenue. Additionally, the proposed Project will be compatible in architectural style and design with the surrounding residential development and will be consistent with the Citywide Design Guidelines.

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

As stated above, two variances and one grading exception are included with this Project. P15-1081 Variance will allow the development to include the design and construction of three story buildings for approximately 90% of the Project's dwelling units. P15-1080 Variance will allow for a reduced setback of 15 feet for a single story multiple family building (Building 5), which is located near the corner of Central Avenue and Quail Run Road. P15-1082 Grading Exception is requesting an exception to the regulations contained in Title 17 of the Riverside Municipal Code to accommodate the Project's proposed grading plan. As discussed in the Project Description and throughout this initial study, the grading plan is designed to protect existing and provide the opportunity to expand biological values on the Project site. By allowing implementation of the Project's grading plan, the grading exception will also alleviate flooding at Canyon Crest Fire Station No. 14. Because the grading plan results in building pads that are higher than the Box Springs Dam spillway, granting the grading exception will not result in the placement of structures within a 100 year flood zone..

The Project proposes only one building that will be at street grade adjacent to Central Avenue and Quail Run Road. P15-1080 Variance and the grading exception will allow for the balance of the three story buildings to be constructed well below the grade of the adjacent streets and adjacent buildings. These proposed pad elevations will be approximately 30 feet below the elevation at the Central Avenue and Quail Run Road, essentially hiding the buildings from the street view and neighboring structures. Granting the variances and grading exception will minimize impacts to aesthetics by allowing the development to be constructed and designed in a way which will allow for the development's buildings to blend in the with the setbacks of the existing buildings while not visually blocking views from surrounding properties.

For the reasons set forth in the preceding paragraphs, with approval of the variances and grading exceptions, the Project will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts are considered **less than significant**.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Please see Response 4f above.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The mineral resource zone (MRZ) mapped for this area is MRZ-3. This classification is an area where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist, however, the significance of the deposit is undetermined. Given the size and location of the Project site in relationship to surrounding residential uses, it is highly unlikely that any surface mining or mineral recovery

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

operation could feasibly take place in these areas. For these reasons direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts with regard to the loss of a known mineral resource are **less than significant**.

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

No Impact. The GP 2025 FPEIR determined that there are no specific areas within the City or its Sphere of Influence which have locally important mineral resource recovery sites and that the implementation of the General Plan 2025 would not significantly preclude the ability to extract state designated resources. Therefore **no impacts** are anticipated.

12. NOISE.

Would the project result in:

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

12a. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The only source of continuous noise at the Project site is traffic from Central Avenue and Interstate 215. According to the GP 2025 FPEIR, portions of the Project site are within the 70 dBA CNEL, 65 dBA CNEL, and 60 dBA CNEL Central Avenue noise contours for both the existing condition and at GP 2025 Buildout. Buildings 5 and 11 are within the 70 CNEL contour and Building 11, the south portion of Buildings 6 and 9, and the leasing office/fitness center/recreation complex are within the 65 CNEL contour from Central Avenue. All other buildings are within the 60 CNEL contour. Portions of the site are within the 60 CNEL contour from Interstate 215 in the existing and GP 2025 Buildout condition. The Project site is also subject to periodic noise in the form of sirens and other operations for the adjacent fire station. The Project site is not subject to railroad noise.

In compliance with California Government Code Section 65302, the GP 2025 Noise Element identifies noise and land use compatibility criteria that identifies “Normally Acceptable,” “Conditionally Acceptable,” “Normally Unacceptable,” and “Conditionally Unacceptable” noise exposure ranges for various land uses as shown in GP 2025, Figure N-10. These standards are primarily used for planning purposes such as determining a project’s compatibility with a proposed site with regard to existing and future acoustical impacts upon a project site sourced from the surrounding environment

As with all development projects, the proposed residential units will be constructed with materials to ensure that the interior noise levels do not exceed 45 CNEL. The GP 2025 noise and land use compatibility criteria indicates that single-family residential projects within the 60-65 CNEL are considered “Conditionally Acceptable” and projects within the 65-70 CNEL are “Normally Unacceptable.” Both of these criteria require a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements and needed noise insulation is required to be included in the design of the project.

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

The only units that would be exposed to the higher noise levels from Central Avenue are the two buildings closest to Central Avenue, Building 5 and Building 10. The remaining buildings are set further back or are behind other buildings, which provide some noise attenuation. Mitigation measure **MM NOISE 1**, which requires documentation that the specific architectural materials proposed for these building will achieve an interior noise level no greater than 45 CNEL. With regard to exterior noise, balconies on Building 5 and Building 10 that face Central Avenue will likely be exposed to exterior noise levels in excess of City standards. This can be mitigated through the use of noise barriers. Transparent noise barriers are available, which will block noise but allow a view to be maintained. Balconies on Building 5 and Building 10 that are oriented away from Central Ave, i.e. that face into the Project site may not require noise barriers because the apartment building may provide sufficient attenuation. Mitigation measure MM Noise 2, which requires the balconies on Building 5 and Building 10 that front Central Avenue to incorporate shielding so that noise levels will be consistent with the City's exterior noise standards. Impacts will be reduced to **less than significant with mitigation**.

MM NOISE 1: Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any apartment building, documentation shall be submitted to the City confirming that the architectural materials to be used will achieve an interior noise level no greater than 45 CNEL.

MM NOISE 2: In order to reduce exterior noise levels to the daytime exterior noise level consistent with Section 7.25.010 of Title 7 of the Riverside Municipal Code, the balconies on Building 5 and Building 10, that front Central Avenue shall incorporate noise attenuating shields composed of tempered glass, transparent plexi glass, or lexan.

Construction noise is discussed in Response 12g, below.

b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

12b. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise)

Less Than Significant Impact. Groundborne vibration is not a common environmental problem. It is unusual for vibration from sources such as buses and trucks to be perceptible, even in locations close to major roads. Some common sources of ground-borne vibration are trains, buses on rough roads, and heavy construction activities such as blasting, pile-driving, and extensive grading and heavy earth-moving equipment. Construction of the Project would not incorporate any of these sources. Additionally, groundborne vibration and groundborne noise are not associated with the proposed channel improvements or any maintenance operations these facilities may require. Thus, construction, operation and associated maintenance will not produce any substantial groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

As stated above, groundborne vibration and noise impacts are typically associated with heavy construction activities such as blasting, pile driving or extensive grading. The borrow site will involve the excavation, removal and movement of approximately 89,900 CY of soil from the borrow area to create building pads for the apartment buildings, internal roads, and parking lots. To move soil from one location of the Project site to another it can be assumed bulldozers, loaders, and production trucks will be used as opposed to blasting and pile driving. Because no impact devices are expected to be used, impacts regarding groundborne vibration and groundborne noise **are less than significant**.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12c. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located in an area dominated by other multi-family residential uses. Although noise sensitive residential uses surround the Project site, given that the Project is located along a major arterial street (Central Avenue) and in close proximity I-215, both of which are contributors to the existing noise environment, the increase in noise levels generated by the operation of this project would be less than significant. Site operations, i.e. noise generated by the activities of the residents and property maintenance, will be required to be conducted in compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance (Title 7 of the Municipal Code). Compliance with the Noise Ordinance will ensure that any increased noise level should not be more than what was previously considered and approved as part of the General Plan and should not be detrimental to any surrounding land uses.

d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The primary source of temporary or periodic noise associated with the proposed Project is from construction activity and maintenance work. Construction noise typically involves the loudest common urban noise events associated with building demolition, grading, construction, large diesel engines, truck deliveries and hauling. Both the GP 2025 and Municipal Code Title 7 (Noise Code) limit construction activities to specific times and days of the week and during those specified times, construction activity is subject to the noise standards provided in the Title 7.

Project construction will take place in four phases: grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating. The entire site will be graded prior to commencing with the other phases. Grading will involve the use of excavators, graders, dozers, scrapers, and tractors/loaders/backhoes. Building construction will entail the use of cranes, forklifts generator sets. Paving will entail the use of pavers and rollers, and architectural coatings will entail the use of air compressors. The following table presents the noise levels associated with this equipment.

Equipment	Noise Level (dBA) 50 ft. from Source
Air Compressor	81
Backhoe	80
Concrete Mixer	85
Concrete Pump	82

**ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING
INFORMATION SOURCES):**

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less Than
Significant
With
Mitigation
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No
Impact

Equipment	Noise Level (dBA) 50 ft. from Source
Concrete Vibrator	76
Crane, Mobile	83
Dozer	85
Excavator	81
Generator	81
Grader	85
Loader	85
Paver	89
Roller	85
Scraper	89
Truck	88

The nearest sensitive receptor is the residential development that abuts the Project to north. The nearest residence is approximately 85 feet north of the borrow site at an elevation approximately 15 feet above the borrow site. At that distance, the receptor will be exposed to construction noise from graders, dozers, scrapers, and tractors/loaders/backhoes in the range of 85 dBA to 89 dBA assuming the equipment was stationary. However, the equipment used for grading will not operate in one location continuously. Grading equipment will move around the Project site taking dirt from the borrow area transporting it to the southern portion of the site, which is approximately 500 feet south. Once grading is complete, construction will be limited to the southern portion of the Project site. At a distance of approximately 500 feet, noise from equipment used during building construction, paving, and architectural coatings will range from 56 to 64 dBA² at the residential development north of the Project site. To assure Project related construction noise impacts are not substantial, mitigation measures **MM NOISE 3** through **MM NOISE 5** shall be implemented

Project-related operational noise will result from maintenance activities associated with the restoration area and noise from the apartment buildings. Operational noise is not expected to be substantially perceptible to surrounding off-site uses. Further the operation of the Project is not expected to expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards for residential uses. Therefore, impacts associated with operational noise would be less than significant.

MM NOISE 3: Two weeks prior to the commencement of construction, notification must be provided to surrounding land uses disclosing the construction schedule, including the various types of activities that would be occurring throughout the duration of the construction period. For the duration of construction activities, the construction manager shall serve as the contact person should noise levels become disruptive to local residents. A sign shall be posted at the Project site with the contact phone number.

² Calculated using the distance attenuation formula $dBA_2 = dBA_1 + 10 \log_{10}(D_1/D_2)^{2+\alpha}$
dBA₁ = 81 and 89; D₁=50 feet, D₂=500 feet; α = 0.5 for soft site conditions

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

MM NOISE 4: Prior to and during construction activities, the Project contractor shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturer standards.

MM NOISE 5: The construction contractor shall locate noise generating construction equipment and construction staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors (nearby residences) that are nearest the Project site. The location of the construction staging areas shall be shown on the construction specifications and shall be reviewed by the City prior to the issuance of grading permit.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

12e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contour, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan November 13, 2014)

Less Than Significant Impact. Despite the proposed Project being located within an airport land use plan, the proposed Project is located beyond the 60 dB CNEL and is not located within any of the airport noise contour areas as depicted on Exhibit MA-4 of the RCALUCP. As a result, the proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels related to airport noise. Therefore, direct, indirect, and cumulative **impacts are less than significant**.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

12f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (November 13, 2014))

No Impact. The proposed Project is not located within in two miles of a private airstrip and furthermore there are no private airstrips located within the City that would expose people working or residing in the City to excessive noise levels. Therefore **no impacts** are anticipated.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

13a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table LU-3 – Land Use Designations, FPEIR Table 5.12-A – SCAG Population and Households Forecast, Table 5.12-B – General Plan Population and Employment Projections–2025, Table 5.12-C – 2025 General Plan and SCAG Comparisons, Table 5.12-D - General Plan Housing Projections 2025, Capital Improvement Program and SCAG’s RCP and RTP)

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project consists of the construction of a 216 unit multiple family residential apartment complex. According to the General Plan, as of 2010 the City had a population of approximately 300,000 and a projected population of 346,867 by the year 2025. The proposed Project will provide new residential units which could be construed to induce population growth. The Project also includes a GPA and zone change that will change a portion of the Project site's General Plan land use designation from Open Space to Medium High Density Residential and its zoning from Public Facilities to R-3-3000 Multi-Family Residential. However, the number of new units and subsequent growth in population is minimal when compared to the overall population of the City of Riverside. Hence, while the proposed Project will increase population, the amount of growth is not significant and is within the rate of growth projected under general plan buildout projections. The Project does not include the extension of roads or other infrastructure facilities. For these reasons, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to population will be **less than significant**.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

13b. Response: (Source: Google Earth)

No Impact. The Project site is vacant undeveloped land. There are currently no residential units on the project site. The Project does not require any off-site construction. For these reasons there will be **no impact** directly, indirectly, or cumulatively with regard to the displacement of housing, resulting in the need for replacement housing elsewhere.

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

13c. Response: (Source: Google Earth)

No Impact. The Project site is vacant undeveloped land. Thus, there are no residents living on the Project site so development of the proposed Project would not displace people, resulting in the need for replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, **no impacts** are anticipated.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES.

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

a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The development of the proposed Project will result in the construction of 216 residential dwelling units. The addition of these structures and residents would increase the number of responses for fire protection services and emergency medical services to the Project site and vicinity. However, the proposed Project is in adjacent to the Sycamore Canyon Fire Station “Station 14” located at 725 Central Avenue, which will provide adequate fire services to the proposed Project. In addition, the proposed Project will be

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

required to implement General Plan 2025 policies and comply with existing codes, standards and practices set forth by the City of Riverside Fire Department. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Police services and facilities will be provided by the Riverside Police Department (RPD). In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies and compliance with existing codes and standards, and through RPD participation, there will be less than significant impacts on the demand for additional police facilities or services either directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.

c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

14c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D – RUSD, Figure 5.13-3 – AUDS Boundaries, Table 5.13-E – AUDS, Table 5.13-G – Student Generation for RUSD and AUDS By Education Level, and Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries)

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located within the Riverside Unified School District (RUSD). The closest elementary school is Seneca Elementary School located approximately 1.5 miles to the southeast at 11615 Wordsworth, Moreno Valley, CA, and is not a part of the Riverside Unified School District. Elementary Schools that are close to the Project site that are located within the Riverside Unified School district are Emerson Elementary School located at 4660 Ottawa Avenue, approximately 1.7 miles northwest of the Project site and Castle View Elementary School located at 6201 Shaker Drive, approximately 1.7 miles southwest of the Project site, Taft Elementary School located at 959 Mission Grove Parkway N, approximately 1.9 miles south of the Project site. The closest middle schools are Riverside STEM Academy located at 3380 14th Street, approximately 1 mile to the northeast of the Project site, University Heights Middle School located at 1155 Massachusetts, approximately 2.3 miles north of the Project site, Central Middle School located at 4795 Magnolia Avenue, approximately 3.7 miles to the northwest of the Project site. The closest high schools are John W North High School located at 1550 3rd Street, approximately 2 miles to the northwest and Riverside Poly High School located at 5450 Victoria Avenue, approximately 2.5 miles to the west

Development of the Project would result in 216 dwelling units, thereby increasing the number of school age children within the local Districts. However, Assembly Bill 2926 and Senate Bill 50 assist in providing school facilities to serve students generated by new development projects by allowing school districts to collect impact fees from developers of new residential. Therefore, with the payment of school impact mitigation fees, **impacts are less than significant impact.**

d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

14d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Parks Master Plan 2003, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative)

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project consists of 216 residential units and includes recreational amenities as part of the apartment complex. Adequate park facilities and services are provided in the Canyon Crest Neighborhood to serve this Project. In addition with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Park , Recreation and Community Services practices there will be

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

less than significant impacts on the demands for additional park facilities or services either directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.

e. Other public facilities?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

14e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure LU-8 – Community Facilities, FPEIR Figure 5.13-5 - Library Facilities, Figure 5.13-6 - Community Centers, Table 5.3-F – Riverside Community Centers, Table 5.13-H – Riverside Public Library Service Standards)

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project will result in an incremental increased demand for library services and medical services due to the addition of 216 dwelling units. Adequate public facilities and services, including libraries and community centers, are in close proximity to serve the proposed Project. Implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards and through Park and Recreation and Community Services and Library practices impacts will be **less than significant**.

15. RECREATION.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

15a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Figure CCM-6 – Master plan of Trails and Bikeways, Parks Master Plan 2003, FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative, Table 5.14-D – Inventory of Existing Community Centers, Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 16.60 - Local Park Development Fees, Bicycle Master Plan May 2007)

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the Project would result in 216 medium high density residential dwelling units and may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks such as the adjacent Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park. However, the proposed Project includes community recreational amenities consisting of the addition of 2.81 acres of open space for recreational purposes. These proposed amenities are considered neighborhood serving, whereby it is anticipated that the residents of the proposed Project would utilize the on-site recreational amenities to meet some of the demand for parks. While an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and trail facilities may occur, the recreational amenities that are provided as a part of the Project will lessen any substantial physical deterioration to existing recreation facilities in the area. Quail Run Park is an undeveloped open space park located over one-quarter of a mile west of the Project site. Given that there is no direct access from the proposed apartments to this park, Project implementation will not degrade this park. For these reasons direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to existing parks will be **less than significant**.

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

15b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025)

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project's proposed amenities include recreational facilities and open space, which is within the Project boundary. The potential environmental impacts resulting from construction of these amenities are analyzed in the individual issues areas throughout this document, .e.g., Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, etc... Therefore, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts are **less than significant**.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project result in:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16a. Response: (Source: *Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Albert A. Webb Associates, February 2015*)

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was prepared by Albert A. Webb Associates to evaluate the proposed Project's impacts on traffic. The following discussion is summarized from the TIA.

Trip generation represents the amount of traffic traveling to and from the Project. Trip generation rates used to estimate Project traffic are identified in the **Table, Trip Generation Rates** of the TIA, and are based upon data collected by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, 2012. Based on the analysis in the TIA, the Project is anticipated to generate a total of 1,463 daily trip-ends including 112 trip-ends during the AM peak hour and 136 trip-ends during the PM peak hour.

The study area for the Project's TIA includes the following intersections:

1. Chicago Avenue (NS) / Central Avenue (EW)
2. El Cerrito Drive (NS) / Central Avenue (EW)
3. Canyon Crest Drive (NS) / Central Avenue (EW)
4. Project Driveway (NS) / Central Avenue (EW)
5. Quail Run Road (NS) / Central Avenue (EW)
6. Lochmoor Drive (NS) / Central Avenue (EW)
7. Sycamore Canyon Boulevard (NS) / Central Avenue (EW)
8. I-215 Southbound Ramps (NS) / Central Avenue (EW)
9. Central Avenue (NS) / I-215 Northbound Off-Ramp (EW)

Study area intersections selected in the scoping agreement were based on preliminary trip generation and trip distribution. During traffic study preparation, we determined that the intersection of Watkins Drive and I-215 Northbound on-ramp will have very minimal project traffic (14 trips in the AM and 7 in the PM, much less than the 50 trip threshold). Therefore, it is not included in the TIA.

The study area includes the following roadway segments along Central Avenue:

1. Chicago Avenue to El Cerrito Drive
2. El Cerrito Drive to Canyon Crest Drive
3. Canyon Crest Drive to Project Driveway
4. Project Driveway to Quail Run Road
5. Quail Run Road to Lochmoor Drive
6. Lochmoor Drive to Sycamore Canyon Boulevard

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

The Sycamore Canyon Boulevard to I-215 Northbound on-ramp was not analyzed due to the length of these segments. The Highway Capacity Manual advises that the operation of short roadway segments is controlled by the operation of the intersections rather than the capacity of the roadway segment itself.

Currently, all intersections and roadway segments studied in the TIA, operate at an acceptable LOS in the existing condition (i.e., without Project traffic). All intersections and segments operate at an acceptable LOS in the existing plus ambient growth plus Project condition. For the scenario that assumes buildout per the 2025 General Plan plus Project-generated traffic, the following intersections are expected to operate at an unacceptable LOS:

1. Chicago Avenue (NS) / Central Avenue (EW) (LOS E – AM Peak Hour)
3. Canyon Crest Drive (NS) / Central Avenue (EW) (LOS E & F – AM & PM Peak Hour)
5. Quail Run Road (NS) / Central Avenue (EW) (LOS F – AM & PM Peak Hour)
6. Lochmoor Drive (NS) / Central Avenue (EW) (LOS F – AM Peak Hour)
7. Sycamore Canyon Boulevard (NS) / Central Avenue (EW) (LOS F – PM Peak Hour)
9. Central Avenue (NS) / I-215 NB Off-Ramp (EW) (LOS F – AM Peak Hour)

However, the TIA concluded that direct impacts from Project-related traffic will be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of the following mitigation measures: .

MM Trans 1: Prior to issuance of any building permits the Project Developer shall make fair share contributions towards the following:

- Second westbound left turn pocket at the intersection of Canyon Crest Drive and Central Avenue;
- Installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Quail Run Road and Central Avenue;
- Construction of a second north-ward bound (NWB) thru land at the intersection of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard and Central Avenue.

MM Trans 2: Sight distance at the Project driveways shall be reviewed with respect to standard Caltrans and City of Riverside’s sight distance standards at the time of preparation of final grading, landscape, and street improvement plans.

MM Trans 3: To mitigate project-related impacts to off-site traffic signals, the Project shall participate in the phased construction of off-site traffic signals through payment of the City of Riverside Development Impact Fee in effect at the time of Project construction.

MM Trans 4: To mitigate project-related impacts to off-site traffic signals, the Project shall participate in the phased construction of off-site traffic signals through payment of the City of Riverside Development Impact Fee and the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee in effect at the time of Project construction.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

16b. Response: (Source: *Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Albert A. Webb Associates on February 2015*)

No Impact. The Project site does not include a state highway or principal arterial within Riverside County's Congestion Management Program (CMP). Therefore, there is **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the CMP.

c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

16c. Response: (Source: *General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (November 13, 2014)*)

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project does not propose an action that could result in a change in air traffic patterns. However as discussed above in Hazards, the Project has been reviewed by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (RCALUC). The proposed Project does not include water or other features that would attract large concentrations of birds or otherwise affect air traffic. Therefore, impacts are **less than significant**.

d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

16d. Response: (Source: *Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Albert A. Webb Associates on February 2015*)

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed Project will not change the current roadway configurations nor alter the area in such a way as to introduce a new hazard or increase hazards. Therefore, **no impacts** are anticipated.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

16e. Response: (Source: *Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Albert A. Webb Associates, February 2015*)

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project has been designed to meet City of Riverside standards for safety and access; therefore impacts will be **less than 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

16f. Response: (Source: *FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation and Community Mobility and Education Elements, Bicycle Master Plan, School Safety Program – Walk Safe! – Drive Safe!*)

Less Than Significant Impacts. The proposed Project as designed is not in conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The Project area is currently served by the Riverside Transit

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

Agency (RTA) which serves the City of Riverside. Currently, RTA Routes 16 and 51 serve roadways within the vicinity of the Project area. There are two RTA stops on Central Avenue in proximity to the Project site. One stop is approximately 740 feet east of the intersection of Central Avenue and Quail Run Road; the second stop is approximately 170 west of the western boundary of the Project site. Transit service is reviewed and updated by RTA periodically to address ridership, budget and community demand needs. Changes in land use can affect these periodic adjustments which may lead to either enhanced or reduced service where appropriate. However roadway improvements are anticipated to provide safe and efficient pedestrian connections between the proposed Project and surrounding area through construction of sidewalks along the Project frontage. Therefore impacts are **less than significant**.

17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES.

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Water The project site is within an area where it will connect to existing wastewater infrastructure and treatment facilities. Wastewater service for the proposed Project will be provided by the Riverside Public Works which provides for the collection, treatment, and disposal of all wastewater generated within approximately 74 square miles within the northern sphere of the City of Riverside, and through its Regional Water Quality Treatment Plant (RRWQCP) and complies with State and federal requirements governing the treatment and discharge of wastewater. Although the proposed Project proposes to change the current land use to include multi family residential, the surrounding area is already built up with residential landuses and the development of the site has already been factored into the General Plan 20-year horizon which has projected there to be sufficient wastewater treatment systems. Thus, the proposed Project will not exceed existing wastewater infrastructure and treatment facilities. Thus, the development of the proposed project would not be anticipated exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Therefore, **no impacts** are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

17b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU PROJECTED DOMESTIC WATER Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, FPEIR Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU Including Water Reliability for 2025, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities and Figure 5.16-6 – Sewer Infrastructure and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR.)

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is located within the Riverside Public Utilities Department Service (RPU) Area water and wastewater/sanitary sewer service area. According to the City of Riverside Certified Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report, the City of Riverside Public Works Department wastewater collection system includes over 776 miles of gravity sewers that range in size from 6 to 54 inches in

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

diameter; 18 wastewater pump stations which are designed for flows of 100 to 400 gallons per minute (gpm); there are two large lift stations with design capacities in excess of 2,000 gpm. Additionally, the RRWQCP currently treats approximately 33 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater for over 280,000 residents in the City of Riverside and the Jurupa, Edgemont, Rubidoux, and Highgrove communities. In 2005 the plant had a capacity of 40 mdg and as of 2013 the plant allowed for the treatment of 50 mgd. Although the proposed Project will be required to construct new lines to connect to existing systems, the construction of these systems are anticipated in the City's buildout. Therefore, impacts are considered **less than significant**.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

17c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 and FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities)

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the Project will require construction of an on-site storm water drainage system to carry flows away from the Project site into the area's storm drain system. A project-specific *Conceptual Water Quality Management Plan* was prepared to identify the existing and proposed hydrological conditions. Subdivision Code (Title 18, Section 18.48.020) requires drainage fees to be paid to the City for new construction. Fees are transferred into a drainage facilities fund that is maintained by Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. This Section also complies with the California Government Code (section 66483), which provides for the payment of fees for construction of drainage facilities. Fees are required to be paid as part of the conditions of approval/waiver for filing of a final map or parcel map.

General Plan 2025 Policies PF 4.1 and PF 4.3 require the City to continue to routinely monitor its storm drain system and to fund and improve those systems as identified in the City's Capital Improvement plan. Implementation of these policies will ensure that the City is adequately served by drainage systems. The General Plan 2025 also includes policies and programs that will minimize the environmental effects of the development of such facilities. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Water service to the project site will be provided by Riverside Public Utilities (RPU) from existing water supplies. **Impacts will be less than significant.**

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

17e. Response: (Source: : General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU PROJECTED DOMESTIC WATER Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, FPEIR Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU Including Water Reliability for 2025, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

of Riverside's Sewer Service Area, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities and Figure 5.16-6 – Sewer Infrastructure and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)

Less Than Significant Impact. Please see 17b above.

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

17f. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.16-A – Existing Landfills and Table 5.16-M – Estimated Future Solid Waste Generation from the Planning Area)

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would provide for the development of 216 residential dwelling units. The Project site is located within the jurisdiction of the Riverside County Waste Management Department and is serviced by the City of Riverside Public Works Department, which collects the solid waste with option of hauling waste to El Sobrante, Badlands Landfills, or Lamb Canyon Landfill after being sorted at the Robert A. Nelson transfer station. The **Landfill Capacity** table, below, reflects the amount of capacity remaining and maximum tonnage accepted at each facility.

Landfill Capacity

Landfill	Remaining Capacity (Tons)	Maximum Daily Throughput (Tons/Day)
El Sobrante	145,530,000	16,054
Badlands	14,730,025	4,000
Lamb Canyon	18,955,000	5,000

Source: CR(a), CR(b), CR(c)

As shown in the **Solid Waste Generation** table below, the Project is estimated to generate 1,540 pounds of solid waste per day or 0.77 tons per day which is less than 1% of the maximum daily capacity of El Sobrante Landfill, Badlands Landfill, or Lamb Canyon Landfill.

Solid Waste Generation

Land Use		Units		Pounds Per Day Solid Waste	
				<i>Per Unit</i>	<i>Total</i>
Multi-Family Residential		216		7	1,512
				Solid Generation Tons Per Day	
					0.76

In addition, Public Resources Code 41780 requires every city and county to divert from landfills at least 60% of the quantity of waste generated within their jurisdiction in 2004. Because the Project will be regulated by waste reduction and diversion from landfill programs the proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in demand for local solid waste disposal facilities and regional landfill capacity.

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

At the rate of use this would result in over 60 years of capacity between the three landfills. The project is served by landfills with sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste. Therefore impacts are less than significant.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

17g. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR)

Less Than Significant Impact. The California Integrated Waste Management Act under the Public Resources Code requires that local jurisdictions divert at least 60% of all solid waste generated by January 1, 2004. With the approval of the proposed project, the development would be consistent with the City's General Plan and future residents would participate in the recycling programs provided by the City. Thus, the Project would not conflict with any federal, State, or local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts are less than significant

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or an endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

18a. Response: (Source: *Focused Biological Assessment prepared by Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. (NRAI) on March 20, 2015, and site specific Cultural Resources Survey prepared by CRM Tech, dated February 5, 2015*)

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in the checklist above, the proposed Project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment. The biological survey prepared to determine current biological resources located on the Project site did not find that the Project will substantially degrade biological resources. Further, no archaeological historical resources are found on the Project site. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

18b. Response: (Source: *FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program*)

Less Than Significant Impact. Because the Project will not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts, there will be no cumulative impact beyond those previously considered in the GP 2015 FPEIR.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18c. Response: *(Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program)*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Effects on human beings were evaluated as part of the aesthetics, air quality, hydrology & water quality, noise population and housing, hazards and hazardous materials, and traffic sections of this initial study and found to be less than significant for each of the above sections. Based on the analysis and conclusions in this initial study, the proposed Project will not cause substantial adverse effects directly or indirectly to human beings. Therefore, potential direct and indirect impacts on human beings that result from the proposed Project are **considered less than significant with mitigation.**

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).

Remainder of page intentionally blank

References

The following documents were referenced as general information sources during the preparation of this document. They are available for public review at the locations listed for each reference. These documents may also be available at public libraries and at other public agency offices.

Alfa Investments	Alfa Investments, <i>Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan for the Quail Run Apartments</i> . August 2014. (Appendix D)
AQ/GHG	Albert A. WEBB Associates, <i>Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Analysis for the Quail Run Apartment Project</i> , March 24, 2015. (Appendix A)
AQMP	South Coast Air Quality Management District, <i>Air Quality Management Plan 2012</i> , February 2013. (Available at http://www.aqmd.gov/home/library/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan/final-2012-air-quality-management-plan , accessed March 24, 2015.)
CR(a)	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), <i>Active Landfills Profile for El Sobrante Landfill (33-AA-0217)</i> . (Available at http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/33-AA-0217/Detail/ , accessed March 26, 2015.)
CR(b)	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), <i>Active Landfills Profile for Badlands Sanitary Landfill (33-AA-0006)</i> . (Available at http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/33-AA-0006/Detail/ , accessed March 26, 2015.)
CR (c)	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), <i>Active Landfills Profile for Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill (33-AA-0007)</i> . (Available at http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/33-AA-0007/Detail/ , accessed March 26, 2015.)
CRM TECH	CRM Tech, <i>Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report for the Quail Run Apartment Project</i> , February 5, 2015. (Appendix C)
EnviroStor	California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Envirostor database website. (Available at http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/ , December 15, 2015.)
FPEIR	Final Program Environmental Impact Report for City of Riverside General Plan and Supporting Documents, certified November 2007. (Available at http://www.riversideca.gov/planning/gp2025program/FPEIR_V2.asp , accessed December 12 through March 26, 2015.)
GP 2025	City of Riverside, General Plan 2025, adopted November 2007. (Available at http://www.riversideca.gov/planning/gp2025program/general-plan.asp , accessed December 12 through March 26, 2015.)
Google Earth 2015	Google Earth. 33° 57' 19.78" N and 117° 19' 14.90" W. Accessed December 11 through March 26, 2015.)
Health and Safety Code	California Health and Safety Code. (Available at http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/calawquery?codesection=hsc , accessed March 26, 2015.)

MSHCP	Riverside County, <i>Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan</i> , adopted June 2003. (Available at http://rctlma.org/Portals/0/mshcp/volume1/index.html , accessed March 25, 2015.)
NRAI(a)	Natural Resource Assessment, Inc. <i>Focused Biological Assessment for the Quail Run Development</i> , August 5, 2015. (Appendix B)
NRAI(b)	Natural Resource Assessment, Inc. <i>Determination of a Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation Plan for the Quail Run Development</i> , August 5, 2015. (Appendix B)
Public Resources Code	California Public Resources Codes. (Available at http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/html/prc_table_of_contents.html , accessed January 5 through February 9, 2015.)
RCA JPR	Regional Conservation Authority, <i>RCA Joint Project Review (JPR) #15-04-15-01</i> , August 17, 2015. (Appendix B)
RCALUCP	Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, <i>March Air Reserve Base / Inland Port Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan</i> , adopted November 13, 2014. (Available at http://www.rcaluc.org/plan_new.asp , accessed March 25, 2015.)
RCTC CMP	Riverside County Transportation Commission, <i>2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program</i> , December 14, 2011. (Available at http://www.rctc.org/uploads/media_items/congestionmanagementprogram.original.pdf , accessed March 30, 2015.)
RMC	City of Riverside, <i>Municipal Code</i> . (Available at http://www.riversideca.gov/municode/ , accessed December 16, 2015.)
RTA	Riverside Transit Agency, System Map, January 2015. (Available at http://www.riversidetransit.com/index.php/riding-the-bus/maps-schedules , accessed March 25, 2015.)
TIA	Albert A. WEBB Associates, <i>Traffic Impact Analysis for the Quail Run Apartments</i> , February 2015. (Appendix E)
Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations	Code of Federal Regulations, Title 49 Transportation. (Available at http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title49/49tab_02.tpl , accessed March 26, 2015.)
Zoning Map	City of Riverside, <i>Zoning Map</i> , December 16, 2013. (Available at http://www.riversideca.gov/planning/pdf/maps/zoning.pdf , accessed December 12 through March 26, 2015.)

Document Preparation Staff

Albert A. WEBB Associates, Planning and Environmental Services Department
Cheryl DeGano, Principal Environmental Analyst
Eliza Laws, Senior Environmental Analyst
Dru Maynus, Assistant Environmental Planner

NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY

This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influence area. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (for example: noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you. Business & Professions Code Section 11010 (b) (13)(A)

Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ³	Monitoring/Reporting Method
Biological Resources	MM Bio 1: Site-preparation activities (removal of trees and vegetation) shall be avoided during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31), to the greatest extent possible. If site-preparation cannot be avoided during the nesting season, a breeding bird survey will be conducted to determine if nesting birds are present. Occupied nests will not be disturbed during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31) unless a qualified biologist verifies through non-invasive methods that either (a) the adult birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation; or (b) the juveniles from the occupied nests are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival.	Prior to construction	Planning Division	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval Report documenting results of survey (if needed) filed with the City Planning Division
	MM Bio 2: If the biologist is not able to verify one of the conditions identified in MM Bio 1 , then no disturbance shall occur within 300 feet of non-raptor nests, and within 500 feet of raptor nests, during the breeding season so as to avoid abandonment of the young.	During all construction activities occurring from February 1 through August 31	Planning Division Building and Safety Division	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval Periodic inspection reports
	MM Bio 3: As required by JPR # 15-04-15-01, prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall prepare a restoration plan and provide this plan to the City. The City shall provide the restoration plan to the Regional Conservation Authority, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service prior to issuance of grading permits. After completion of the restoration actions, the City shall be responsible for ensuring that the restoration actions are carried out and successful.	Prior to issuance of grading permits	Planning Division	Approved Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan Completion of restoration actions

³ All agencies are City of Riverside Departments/Divisions unless otherwise noted.

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ³	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	MM Bio 4: Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits the mitigation areas shall be placed under a conservation easement, dedicated to a Resource Conservation District or other approved mitigation entity. The City shall not issue any occupancy permits until they have been provided evidence that the conservation easement has been recorded.	Prior to occupancy permits	Planning Division Building & Safety Division	Copy of recorded conservation easement
	MM Bio 5: Prior to construction, the project applicant shall obtain the necessary authorization from the regulatory agencies for proposed impacts to jurisdictional waters. Project-specific delineations may be required to determine the limits of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) jurisdiction. Impacts to jurisdictional waters shall require authorization by the corresponding regulatory agency. Authorization may include, but is not limited to, a Section 404 permit from the USACE, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB, and a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW. Project-specific impacts to jurisdictional waters shall be mitigated by the USACE, CDFW, and the RWQCB where applicable.	Prior to construction	Planning Division USACE RWQCB CDFW	Issuance of regulatory permits
	MM Bio 6: No trespass beyond that already delimited by construction limits shall occur into jurisdictional waters.	Prior, during, post construction	Building and Safety Division during construction Developer post construction	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval
	MM Bio 7: No drainage for subsequent development will be designed to flow or be directed into this area. All final project design flows will be directed into a formal site collection	Prior, during, post construction	Public Works Department	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval Review and approval of

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ³	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	system.			Project drainage plans
Cultural Resources	<p>MM CR 1: Prior to beginning construction the Project Applicant shall retain a City of Riverside qualified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify unknown archaeological resources. Any newly discovered cultural resource deposits shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation.</p> <p>MM CR 2: At least 30 days prior to beginning Project construction, the Project Applicant shall contact the Pechanga Tribe, Soboba Tribe, and Morongo Tribe to notify the Tribes of grading, excavation, and the monitoring program and, if a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement has not been developed, to develop a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement between the Applicant and the Tribes. The Agreement shall address the treatment of known cultural resources, the designation, responsibilities, and participation of professional Native American Tribal monitors during grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities; project grading and development scheduling; terms of compensation for the monitors; and treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains discovered on the site.</p>	<p>Prior and during construction</p> <p>No later than 30 days prior to any ground disturbing activities</p>	<p>Planning Division</p> <p>Planning Division Project Applicant</p>	<p>Monitoring reports prepared by archaeological monitor</p> <p>Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval Copies of the Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement(s) to be provided to City.</p>

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ³	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	<p>MM CR 3: Prior to beginning Project grading, the Project Archaeologist shall file a pre-grading report with the City (if required) to document the proposed methodology for grading activity observation which will be determined in consultation with the Pechanga Tribe, Soboba Tribe, and Morongo Tribe. Said methodology shall include the requirement for a qualified archaeological monitor to be present and to have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities. In accordance with the agreement(s) required in MM CR 2, the archaeological monitor's authority to stop and redirect grading will be exercised in consultation the Pechanga Tribe, Soboba Tribe, and Morongo Tribe in order to evaluate the significance of any archaeological resources discovered on the property. Tribal and archaeological monitors shall be allowed to monitor all grading, excavation, and groundbreaking activities, and shall also have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities.</p>	Prior to construction	Planning Division Registered Professional Archaeologist	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval Approval of pre-grading report
	<p>MM CR 4: All cultural materials that are collected during the grading monitoring program and from any previous archeological studies or excavations on the project site, with the exception of sacred items, burial goods, and human remains, which will be addressed in the Treatment Agreement required in MM CR 2 shall be tribally curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to a curation facility, which meets the standards set forth in 36 CFR Part 79 for federal repositories. All sacred sites, should they be encountered within the Project site, shall be avoided and preserved as the preferred mitigation, if feasible.</p>	During construction	Planning Division Registered Professional Archaeologist	Evidence of curation provided to the planning Division from archaeologist, if resources are found
	<p>MM CR 5: If inadvertent discoveries of subsurface</p>	During	Planning Division	Compliance with Project

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ³	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	archaeological/cultural resources are discovered during grading, the developer, the project archaeologist, and the Tribe(s) shall assess the significance of such resources and shall meet and confer regarding the mitigation for such resources. Pursuant to Calif. Pub. Res. Code 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method for archaeological resources. If the developer, the project archaeologist, and the Tribe(s) cannot agree on the significance or the mitigation for such resources, these issues will be presented to the Community Development Director for decision. The Community Development Director shall make the determination based on the provisions of CEQA with respect to the archaeological resources and shall take into account the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the Tribe(s). Notwithstanding any other rights available under the lay, the decision of the Community Development Direct shall be appealable to the Planning Commission and/or City Council.	construction	Registered Professional Archaeologist	Conditions of Approval If resources are found, final report documenting significance of find and mitigation to Planning Division from archaeologist.
	MM CR 6: If any paleontological resources are exposed during Project related excavation, ground disturbance activities in the vicinity of the discovery shall be moved and a qualified paleontological resources specialist will be retained by the Project Applicant to evaluate the resources. If the find is determined to be significant, avoidance or other appropriate measures as identified by the paleontological resources specialist shall be implemented. Appropriate measures include a qualified paleontologist to be permitted to recover, evaluate, and curate the finds in accordance with the standards and guidelines of the City of Riverside and the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology.	During construction	Planning Division Qualified Paleontological Resources Specialist	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval If resources are found, final report documenting significance of find and curation to Planning Division from paleontologist.
Geology and Soils	MM Geo 1: Prior to issuance of a grading permit for the Project, a soils or geotechnical report that identifies the potential for landslides on the Project site and provides	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and	Public Works	Review and approval of geotechnical report.

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ³	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	recommendations for grading and foundation support shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. The Project applicant shall implement all recommendations in the approved report.	during project construction		Review of grading and building plans to confirm the recommendations from the approved geotechnical report have been implemented. Construction inspection reports
Noise	MM NOISE 1: Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any apartment building, documentation shall be submitted to the City confirming that the architectural materials to be used will achieve an interior noise level no greater than 45 CNEL.	Prior to issuance of building permits	Planning Division Building & Safety Division	Review and of documentation associated with architectural materials
	MM NOISE 2: In order to reduce exterior noise levels to the daytime exterior noise level consistent with Section 7.25.010 of Title 7 of the Riverside Municipal Code, the balconies on Building 5 and Building 10, that front Central Avenue shall incorporate noise attenuating shields composed of tempered glass, transparent plexi glass, or lexan.	Prior to issuance of building permits	Planning Division Building & Safety Division	Review of building plans.
	MM NOISE 3: Two weeks prior to the commencement of construction, notification must be provided to surrounding land uses disclosing the construction schedule, including the various types of activities that would be occurring throughout the duration of the construction period. For the duration of construction activities, the construction manager shall serve as the contact person should noise levels become disruptive to local residents. A sign shall be posted at the Project site with the contact phone number.	Two weeks prior to the commencement of construction	Project developer to provide notification to surrounding properties. City Planning	Developer to provide evidence of notification to Planning Division

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ³	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	MM NOISE 4: Prior to and during construction activities, the Project contractor shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturer standards.	Prior to and during construction activities	Building & Safety Division Planning Division	Construction Inspection
	MM NOISE 5: The construction contractor shall locate noise generating construction equipment and construction staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors (nearby residences) that are nearest the Project site. The location of the construction staging areas shall be shown on the construction specifications and shall be reviewed by the City prior to the issuance of grading permit.	During construction activities	Planning Division Building and Safety Division Public Works Division	Review of construction plans and specifications Construction inspection
Transportation	<p>MM Trans 1: Prior to issuance of any building permits the Project Developer shall make fair share contributions towards the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second westbound left turn pocket at the intersection of Canyon Crest Drive and Central Avenue; • Installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Quail Run Road and Central Avenue; • Construction of a second north-ward bound (NWB) thru land at the intersection of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard and Central Avenue. 	Prior to issuance of any building permits	Planning Division	Receipt of fair share contribution
	MM Trans 2: Sight distance at the Project driveways shall be reviewed with respect to standard Caltrans and City of Riverside's sight distance standards at the time of preparation of final grading, landscape, and street improvement plans.	Prior to issuance of grading permit	Planning Division Public Works Department	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval Approval of final plans

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ³	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	MM Trans 3: To mitigate project-related impacts to off-site traffic signals, the Project shall participate in the phased construction of off-site traffic signals through payment of the City of Riverside Development Impact Fee in effect at the time of Project construction.	Prior to issuance of first occupancy permit	Planning Division	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval Evidence of payment of fees
	MM Trans 4: To mitigate project-related impacts to off-site traffic signals, the Project shall participate in the phased construction of off-site traffic signals through payment of the City of Riverside Development Impact Fee and the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee in effect at the time of Project construction.	Prior to issuance of first occupancy permit	Planning Division	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval Evidence of payment of fees