

COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTDEPARTMENT

PLANNING DIVISION

DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION

WARD: **Citywide**

1. **Case Number:** P18-0290

2. **Project Title:** City of Riverside Lighting Standards Update

3. **Hearing Date:** May 31, 2018 at 9:00 AM

I. Written Comments: Start: May 4, 2018

End: 5:00 PM on May 25, 2018

5. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside

Community & Economic Development Department

Planning Division

3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor Riverside, CA 92522

6. Contact Person:

Phone Number: (951) 826-5264

8. Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

City of Riverside

Community & Economic Development Department

Planning Division

3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor Riverside, CA 92522

9. General Plan Designation: Multiple General Plan designations in Citywide Project.

10. **Zoning:** All Zones (Citywide)

11. **Description of Project:**

Proposal by the City of Riverside to amend the Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Riverside Municipal Code) for a comprehensive update to Chapter 19.556 - Lighting. Proposed amendments include, but are not limited to: 1) reorganization and update to bring the existing Code into compliance with State laws and technological advancements; 2) new or modified definitions related to lighting; 3) creation of lighting zones; 4) new design and development standards; 5) new procedures for reviewing lighting plans; and 6) establishing prohibited types of lighting.

The proposal sets forth standards to ensure that outdoor lighting is adequate for safety, security and commerce, while preserving the naturally occurring darkness of the night sky by mitigating artificial sky glow created by glare and light trespass.

Outdoor lighting installed or modified after the effective date of the proposed amendments shall comply with the new requirements. This includes new lighting, replacement lighting, and additions or alterations to existing lighting, whether attached to structures, poles, at grade, or any other location.

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

The project is located Citywide and has a variety of surrounding land uses, zoning and general plan designations.

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

a. Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) reviews all legislative proposals that occur within the influence areas of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP).

14. Other Environmental Reviews Incorporated by Reference in this Review:

a. The General Plan 2025 Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR)

15. Acronyms

AICUZ - Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study

AQMP - Air Quality Management Plan AUSD - Alvord Unified School District

CEQA - California Environmental Quality Act

CMP - Congestion Management Plan
EIR - Environmental Impact Report
EMWD - Eastern Municipal Water District
EOP - Emergency Operations Plan

FEMA - Federal Emergency Management Agency

FPEIR - GP 2025 Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report

GIS - Geographic Information System

GHG - Green House Gas GP 2025 - General Plan 2025 IS - Initial Study

LHMP - Local Hazard Mitigation Plan

MARB/MIP - March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

MJPA-JLUS - March Joint Powers Authority - Joint Land Use Study

MSHCP - Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan MVUSD - Moreno Valley Unified School District NCCP - Natural Communities Conservation Plan

OEM - Office of Emergency Services
OPR - Office of Planning & Research, State
PEIR - Program Environmental Impact Report

PW - Public Works, Riverside

RCALUC - Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
RCALUCP - Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

RCP - Regional Comprehensive Plan

RCTC - Riverside County Transportation Commission

RMC - Riverside Municipal Code RPD - Riverside Police Department RPU - Riverside Public Utilities

RTIP - Regional Transportation Improvement Plan

RTP - Regional Transportation Plan RUSD - Riverside Unified School District

SCAG - Southern California Association of Governments SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District

SCH - State Clearinghouse

SKR-HCP - Stephens' Kangaroo Rat - Habitat Conservation Plan

SWPPP - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan

USGS - United States Geologic Survey
WMWD - Western Municipal Water District
WQMP - Water Quality Management Plan

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

	low would be potentially affected by thi ct" as indicated by the checklist on the		impact
Aesthetics	Agriculture & Forest Resources	Air Quality	
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology/Soils	
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology/Water Quality	
Land Use/Planning	Mineral Resources	Noise	
Population/Housing	Public Service	Recreation	
Transportation/Traffic	Tribal Cultural Resources	Utilities/Service Systems	
Mandatory Findings of Significance			
DETERMINATION: (To be comple	ted by the Lead Agency)		
On the basis of this initial evaluatio recommended that:	n which reflects the independent judg	gment of the City of Riverside	e, it is
The City of Riverside finds that the propound a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will	osed project COULD NOT have a signific be prepared.	ant effect on the environment,	
there will not be a significant effect in this	the proposed project could have a signific s case because revisions in the project have EGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepare	been made by or agreed to by	
The City of Riverside finds that the prop ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT	osed project MAY have a significant effe is required.	ct on the environment, and an	
significant unless mitigated" impact on than earlier document pursuant to applicable	osed project MAY have a "potentially sign e environment, but at least one effect 1) have legal standards, and 2) has been addressed ached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL In main to be addressed.	as been adequately analyzed in by mitigation measures based	
because all potentially significant effects DECLARATION pursuant to applicable s	the proposed project could have a signific s (a) have been analyzed adequately in a standards, and (b) have been avoided or mincluding revisions or mitigation measured.	n earlier EIR or NEGATIVE tigated pursuant to that earlier	
Signature	Da	te	
Printed Name & Title Christina Bar	tscher/Associate Planner For	City of Riverside	



COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTDEPARTMENT

PLANNING DIVISION

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 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.
- 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).
- 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?					
1a. Response:					
No Impact. The proposed amendments to the lighting standards at artificial light, thereby reducing overall effects of light pollution. The initiate any physical changes; and the physical development that the restrictive than the current standards. Therefore, the proposed procumulatively.	he proposed (ne amended (Code changes d Code would all	o not, in and ow for is the	of themselves, same or more	
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?					
1b. Response:					
No Impact. The project consists of no actual physical changes to any object in nature or to any building. The proposed amendments to the lighting standards are intended to reduce light pollution and promote night sky aesthetics. The physical development that the amended Code would allow for is the same or more restrictive than the current standards. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact to a scenic resource direct, indirectly or cumulatively. c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality					
of the site and its surroundings?					
No Impact. The proposed project consists of amendments to the lighting standards within the Zoning Code. These standards would be applicable citywide and are designed to reduce light pollution, and protect the night sky from excessive artificial light. The proposed Code changes do not, in and of themselves, initiate any physical changes; and the physical development that the amended Code would allow for is the same or more restrictive than the current standards. Therefore, the project will not degrade the existing visual character of the City and no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the visual character or quality will occur.					
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?					
1d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Area, Title 19 – Article VIII – Chapter 19.556 – Lighting, C				Lighting	

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
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 complied 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?					
2a. Response: No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ord of any land within the City. Therefore, the project will have no in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.					
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?					
2b. Response: No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ordinance, and would not result in the physical development of any land within the City. Therefore the project will not conflict with any existing zoning for agricultural use. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on existing zoning for agricultural uses or Williamson Act contracts.					
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))?					
2c. Response:					
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ordidevelopment of any land within the City. Therefore the project will rezoning of, forest land or timberland. Therefore, the project will have forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned for Timberland Production	not conflict w ve no impact	ith any existing	zoning for, o	or cause	

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact
INFORMATION SOURCES):	Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Impact	Impact
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				\boxtimes
2d. Response:				
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ording of any land within the City. Therefore the project will not be result Furthermore, the City of Riverside has no forest land that can suptimberland. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directloss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	t in the loss opert 10-perce	of forest land on the native tree of	r conversion cover, nor do	of forest land. es it have any
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?				
2e. Response:				
No Impact . The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ordi of any land within the City. Therefore the project will not result in a in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use, or conversion of foccur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively which agricultural uses, or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	ny changes ir orest land to i	n the existing er non-forest use.	nvironment th Therefore, n o	at could result o impacts will
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?				\boxtimes
3a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air CalEEMod 2007 Model)				
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting order of any land within the City. The project does not directly or indirectly As such, the project does not in conflict with the General Plan 2025 F. The proposed project will not conflict or obstruct implementation of will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the implementation.	y create cons Program "Typ the applicable	truction, gradin ical Growth Sc e air quality pla	g or earthmovenario" or the an, and therefor	ving activities. 2007 AQMP. ore this project
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
3b. Response (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, URBEMIS 2007 Model, CalEEMod 2007 Model)				
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ordinair quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projectly or indirectly create construction, grading or earthmoving act more restrictive light standards to reduce impacts related to light po Code would allow for is the same or more restrictive than the current indirectly or cumulatively to ambient air quality, or contribute to an	ected air qualivities. The publication; and the standards.	lity violation, b project consists the physical dev The project wi	ecause the proof the establist elopment that it have no in	oject does not shment of new t the amended

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 5.3-1 South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air CalEEMod 2007 Model)				
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ordinet increase of any criteria pollutant because the project does not earthmoving activities. The project consists of the establishment of related to light pollution. As such, no impact cumulatively to a net	directly or new more re	indirectly creat strictive light s	e construction tandards to re	on, grading or educe impacts
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
3d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-1 South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air CalEEMod 2007 Model)	~	~	0 0	
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ordinance, and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the project does not directly or indirectly create construction, grading or earthmoving activities that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial short-term pollutant concentrations, and because the project consists of consists of the establishment of new more restrictive light standards to reduce impacts related to light pollution. As such, no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to a sensitive receptor will occur.				
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				
3e. Response: No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ordinance, and would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors because no odors will be generated by the proposed project. The project creates new lighting standards to reduce inappropriate or excessive use of artificial light, thereby reducing overall effects of light pollution. Therefore, no impact related to objectionable odors will occur 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?				
4a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – St Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHO Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCI	CP Cores an Area Plans, Plant Speci	d Linkages, Fi Figure 5.4-4 - es Survey Are	gure OS-8 – MSHCP Crit a, Figure 5.4	MSHCP Cell teria Cells and
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ord physical development of any land within the City. Additionally, the				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
allow for is the same or more restrictive than the current standards. The project will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively on habitat modifications, species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, and policies or regulations of the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.					
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?					
4b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – St Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHO Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Ar	CP Cores an Area Plans, Plant Speci PBurrowing	d Linkages, Fi Figure 5.4-4 - es Survey Are Owl Survey Ar	igure OS-8 – MSHCP Crit a, Figure 5.4	MSHCP Cell teria Cells and 4-7 – MSHCP	
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ordi of any land within the City. Additionally, the physical development more restrictive than the current standards. The project will have no community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service directly, indirectly and cumulative	that the ame impact on an ons, or by the	nded Code wot y riparian habit	ald allow for at or other sea	is the same or nsitive natural	
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?					
4c. Response: (Source: City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS)	Quad Map L	ayer)			
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ording any land within the City. Additionally, the physical development more restrictive than the current standards. The proposed project we defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act directly, indirectly and the Company of the Clean Water Act directly.	that the ame ould have no	nded Code wor impact to fede	uld allow for	is the same or	
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?					
4d. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 - Figure 6	OS-7 – MSH	CP Cores and I	Linkage)		
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ording of any land within the City. Therefore, the proposal will not result migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resider native wildlife nursery sites. In addition, the proposed project in beneficial to nocturnal animals who are adversely affected by excess no impact to wildlife movement directly, indirectly and cumulatively. e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or	in a barrier to the or migrator includes more ive nighttime y.	o the movement y wildlife corrice restrictive light	nt of any national idors, or impending standard	ve resident or ede the use of ds, which are	
ordinance? 4e. Response: (Source: MSHCP, Title 16 Section 16.72.040 - Mitigation Fee, Title 16 Section 16.40.040 - Establishing					
Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual)					

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
No Impact. The project proposes revisions to lighting standards, which are intended to further reduce light pollution. There is no physical development proposed, and the physical development that the amended Code would allow for is the same or more restrictive than the current standards. In addition, the General Plan 2025 includes policies to ensure that future development would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation policies. This project has been reviewed against these policies and found to be in compliance. For these reasons, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation.				
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?				
4f. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Stephens' Ka Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Co Habitat Conservation Plan)	ingaroo Rat l	Habitat Conser	vation Plan, I	Lake Mathews
No Impact. The project proposes revisions to lighting standards, wh is no physical development proposed, and the physical development more restrictive than the current standards. Therefore, the project Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan conservation plan, either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.	that the ame will have no	nded Code wou impact on the	ald allow for a	is the same or of an adopted
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?				
5a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historica Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code)	al Districts ar	nd Neighborho	od Conservat	ion Areas and
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ord building demolition. Furthermore, the proposed Code revisions exergranted a Certificate of Appropriateness. As such, the project will historical resources as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guid	mpt projects ave no impa	that are subject	t to Title 20 a	and have been
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?				\boxtimes
5b. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Arch Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D – Cultural Reso			Figure 5.5-2	? - Prehistoric
No Impact. The project proposes revisions to the City's lighting standards, which does not create or relate to activities involving grading/ground disturbance. Therefore the proposal would not create a potential for disturbance of archeological resources. The project will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.				
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
5c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3)				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	
INFORMATION SOURCES):	Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Impact		
No Impact. The project proposes revisions to lighting standards, which does not create or relate to activities involving grading/ground disturbance. Therefore the proposal would not create a potential for disturbance of paleontological resources or site or unique geologic features. The project will have no impact directly or indirectly on a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.					
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				\boxtimes	
5d. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Arch Cultural Resources Sensitivity)	haeological S	Sensitivity and	Figure 5.5-2	? - Prehistoric	
No Impact. The project proposes revisions to lighting standards, which does not create or relate to activities involving grading/ground disturbance. Therefore the proposal would not create a potential for disturbance of human remains. The project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively regarding the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.					
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:					
 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 - Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)	- Regional F	Cault Zones &	General Plan	2025 FPEIR	
No Impact. The project proposes revisions to the lighting standard. the project, and therefore the proposal would not result in a rupture of that the amended Code would allow for is the same or more restramendment will have no impact related to fault ruptures, either directions.	f a known ear ictive than th	rthquake fault. ne current stand	Any physical dards. The p	l development	
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?					
6ii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Append	dix E – Geote	echnical Repor	t)		
No Impact. The project proposes revisions to the lighting standard. the project, and therefore the proposal would not cause or impact proposal development that the amended Code would allow for is the proposed amendment would have no impact related to seismic grant to the proposed amendment would have no impact related to seismic grant to the proposed amendment would have no impact related to seismic grant to the proposed amendment would have no impact related to seismic grant to the project proposes revisions to the lighting standard.	roperties as a the same or	result of inten- more restrictive	se seismic greathan the curr	ound shaking. ent standards.	
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?					
6iii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – So Geotechnical Report)					
No Impact. The project proposes revisions to the lighting standard. the project, and therefore the proposal would not cause or otherwise failure. The physical development that the amended Code would al standards. The proposed amendment would have no impact , direct related ground failure, including liquefaction.	impact propoler is the	erties as a resul e same or more	t of seismic-r restrictive th	related ground an the current	
iv Landslides?				\square	

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
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, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan SWPPP)					
No Impact. The project proposes revisions to the lighting standard. the project, and therefore the proposal would not pose a risk to areas amended Code would allow for is the same or more restrictive than to landslides as a result of the project, directly, indirectly and cumulated the compact of the project of the pro	prone to land the current st	slides. Any ph	ysical develo	pment that the	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?					
6b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Title 18 – Subdivision Prevention Plan SWPPP)	Code, Title 1	7 – Grading C	ode, Storm W	Vater Pollution	
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ord part of the project, therefore the project does not involve development soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Any physical development that the restrictive than the current standards. The project will have no impa directly, indirectly or cumulatively.	ent, grading a ne amended (ctivities, or stru Code would allo	actures that wo	yould result in same or more	
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?					
6c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Reg General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High S by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Typ	Shrink-Swell	Potential, Figi	ıre 5.6-1 - Ar	eas Underlain	
No Impact. The proposal is an amendment to the City's lighting ore part of the project, therefore the project does not involve development to become unstable. The physical development that the amended Cotthe current standards. The project has no impact on geologic units or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or co	nt, grading ac ode would allo or soil that c llapse, either	tivities, or structure on for is the sa ould become undirectly, indire	ctures that wo me or more re nstable and re	ould cause soil estrictive than esult in an on-	
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?					
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)					
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standar of the project, therefore it does not involve any construction activities pose risk to life or property. The physical development that the amend than the current standards. As such, the project will have no impact expansive soils either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.	s, grading or i ded Code wo	new structures of allow for is	on expansive the same or m	soil that could nore restrictive	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?					
6e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types)					

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standar of the project, and the proposal does not involve any use of septic project will have no impact on or in regards to soils incapable of ade wastewater disposal systems.	tanks or alter	native wastew	ater disposal	systems. The
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:				
No Impact. The proposed project consists of revisions to the lighting standards, and will not result in any physical development. The physical development that the amended Code would allow for is the same or more restrictive than the current standards. Additionally, the revised lighting standards consider the use of LED lighting, which was previously not allowed or not addressed in the old Code; therefore, it is expected that the new lighting standards would assist in reducing energy consumption. Reduced energy consumption can lead to lower GHG emissions depending on how the energy is produced. The project will not conflict with the City's General Plan policies and statewide Building Code requirements designed to reduce GHG emissions since the project will not result in a net increase in GHG emissions, and it will not interfere with the State's goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions stated in AB 32 and Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-30-15. The project will have no impact with respect to GHG emissions.				ve than the reviously not in reducing energy is quirements will not
b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				
No Impact. The proposed project consists of revisions to the lighting standards, and will not result in physical development. The physical development that the amended Code would allow for is the same or more restrictive than the current standards. Additionally, the revised lighting standards consider the use of LED lighting, which was previously not allowed or not addressed in the old Code; therefore, it is expected that the new lighting standards would assist in reducing energy consumption. Reduced energy consumption can lead to lower GHG emissions depending on how the energy is produced. The project will not conflict with the City's General Plan policies and statewide Building Code requirements that reduce GHG emissions. Since the project will not result in a net increase in GHG emissions, it will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation related to the reduction in the emissions of GHG, and therefore no impact will occur directly,				
indirectly and cumulatively in this regard. 8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
Would the project: a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
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) No Impact. The proposed project does not involve transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material because the project consists of proposed changes to the lighting standards. As such, the project will have no impact related to the transport,				
 use, or disposal of any hazardous material either directly, indirectly at the conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? 				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
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)					
No Impact. The proposed project does not involve the use of any impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively for creating a signific reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the respective conditions.	ant hazard to	the public or	r the environ	ment through	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?					
8c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety and CalARP RMP Facilities in the Project Area, Figure 5.13-Figure 5.13-3 AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E AUSD Boundaries, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of Code)	2 – RUSD B Schools, F	Soundaries, Ta igure 5.13-4	ble 5.13-D R – Other Sc	USD Schools, chool District	
No Impact. The proposed project consists of revisions to the lidevelopment. The physical development that the amended Code we current standards. As a result, the proposal does not involve any emission or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing school because the project will have no impact regarding emitting hazardous ematerials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing	rould allow for ssion or handler coposed proje missions or l	or is the same of ing of any haza ct involves revi nandling hazaro	or more restri rdous materia isions to light dous or acute	ctive than the als, substances ing standards. ely hazardous	
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?				\boxtimes	
8d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-5 – Ha CERCLIS Facility Information, Figure 5.7-B – Regulate EnviroStor Database Listed Sites)					
No Impact. The proposed project consists of revisions to the lig development. The physical development that the amended Code w current standards. As such, the project does not involve hazardor Section 65962.5. The project would have no impact on any listed hazard to the public or environment, directly, indirectly or cumulative	ould allow fous materials soll hazardous n	or is the same of sites listed purs	or more restri suant to Gove	ctive than the ernment Code	
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					
8e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP and March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999), Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))					
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the lighting will apply to all development proposals in the City (i.e., a "citywide" Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP); however, the proposexisting Code, especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and Land Use Commission has been provided a copy of the propose	" code revision sed developm glare from lig	on). There are placed standards a ght sources. The	properties that are more restri ae Riverside C	t lie within an ictive than the County Airport	

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
consistency prior to project approval by the City Council. The project will have no impact resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in proximity to an airport, directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
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?				
8f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airp	ort Safety Zo	nes and Influe	nce Areas, R	CALUCP)
No Impact. Because the project consists of proposed revisions to the lighting standards to reduce light pollution. The Code revisions will apply to all development proposals in the City (i.e., a "citywide" code revision). There are properties that lie within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP); however the proposed development standards are more restrictive standards to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources / The project will not expose people residing or working in the City to an safety hazards related to a private airstrip, and would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
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, OEM's Strategic Plan)				
No Impact. The proposed project consists of revisions to the li development or alterations; as such the project will not impair in emergency plan. Therefore, no impact , either directly, indirectly or plan will occur.	nplementation	or physically	interfere wit	th an adopted
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?				
8h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Riverside's EOP, 2002, Riverside Operational Area – Mu Strategic Plan)				
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. The proposed development standards are more restrictive than the existing Code, especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Therefore, no impact regarding wildland fires either directly, indirectly or cumulatively from this project will occur.				existing Code, ose people or
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				\boxtimes
9a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A - Benefi	cial Uses Red	ceiving Water)		
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the lighting any physical development. The proposed development standards are relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. The impacts that would have any effect on water quality or be affer requirements. The project will have no impact directly, indirectly discharge.	e more restrict e project will ected by water	tive than the exi not directly or i er quality stand	isting Code, e indirectly resu dards, or wa	especially as it ult in physical aste discharge

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?				
9b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, Table PF-3 – Weste Supply (AC-FT/YR), RPU Map of Water Supply Basins, I Water Management Plan)	rn Municipa	l Water Distric	t Projected D	omestic Water
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the light include any physical development. The proposed development is especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with ground aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. cumulatively to groundwater supplies.	tandards are tht sources. Twater recharg	more restrictive. The proposal were, such that the	we than the eill not directlere would be a	existing Code, y or indirectly a net deficit in
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?				
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. The proposed development standards are more restrictive than the existing Code, especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. The proposal will not directly or indirectly result in physical development (i.e. through grading, ground disturbance, structures or paving) that would alter the existing drainage patterns of the site. Erosion or siltation on- or off-site will not occur as a result of the Code revisions. The project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to existing drainage patterns.				
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
9d. Response:				
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. The proposed development standards are more restrictive than the existing Code, especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. The project will not directly or indirectly result in physical alteration (i.e. through grading, ground disturbance, structures or additional paving) that would alter any existing drainage patterns, alter the course of stream or river, or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding. Flooding on or off-site as a result of the project will not occur, and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on the rate or amount of surface runoff in any manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.				
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?				
9e. Response:	L	1	<u>I</u>	

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact
INFORMATION SOURCES):	Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Impact	Impact
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. The proposed development standards are more restrictive than the existing Code, especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. The proposal will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or physical alteration (i.e. through grading, ground disturbance, structures or additional paving) that would create or contribute runoff water in excessive of the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The project will not create or contribute runoff water exceeding capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; therefore there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				\boxtimes
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. The proposed development standards are more restrictive than the existing Code, especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. The proposal will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or physical alteration (i.e. through grading, ground disturbance, structures or additional paving) that would create or contribute runoff water that would substantially degrade water quality. The project will not degrade water quality and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
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?				
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and, and does not include any physical development. The proposed development standards are more restrictive than the existing Code, especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. The proposal does not involve construction, therefore there will be no impact caused by this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively, as it will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.				
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
9h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps) No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. The proposed development standards are more restrictive than the existing Code, especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. The project does not involve the construction of any structure, therefore, the project will not place a structure within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows and no impact will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively. i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss,				
injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
9i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Floo	od Hazard Ar	eas, and FEM	A Flood Haze	ard Maps)
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. The proposed development standards are more restrictive than the existing Code, especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. The project does not involve construction, therefore the project will not place a structure within a flood hazard or dam inundation area that would 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 and therefore no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.				
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				
9j. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.8 – Hydr	ology and W	ater Quality)		·

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
No Impact. Tsunamis are large waves that occur in coastal areas; therefore, since the City is not located in a coastal area, no impacts due to tsunamis will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively. Additionally, the proposed project consists of revisions to the lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. The project will not directly or indirectly result in physical alterations. Therefore, no impact potential for seiche or mudflow exists either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.					
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:					
Would the project:					
a. Physically divide an established community?				\boxtimes	
10a.Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urba	ın Design El	ement)			
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the light include any physical development. The proposed development is especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light of land or the creation of streets that could alter the existing surrounding There will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to an estimate b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or	tandards are at sources. Thing pattern of a	more restrictive project does development or	e than the e not involve th	xisting Code, ne subdivision d community.	
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?					
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, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)					
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing lig pollution, and does not include any physical development. The pro the existing Code, especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting conflict with the General Plan 2025, any neighborhood plan, or any s Policy OS-2.5, which states that the City will "Review and feasibility pollution". This project is not a project of Statewide, Regional or Archave no impact on an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation	posed develog , and glare free pecific plan; of creating a eawide Signif	pment standard com light source and would furth 'night-time sky icance. For the	Is are more rees. This projuer the Generally ordinance to see reasons, the	estrictive than ect would not al Plan 2025's o reduce light	
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?					
10c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Figure LU-7 – Plan if one, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings an Guidelines)	Redevelopm Code, Title 7 d Constructi	ent Areas, ente – Noise Code, on, Citywide D	er appropriate Title 17 – Gr esign and Sig	e Specific vading Code, gn	
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing li include any physical development. The proposed development st especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sky, which would have positive wildlife benefits, particularly to have no impact to any habitat conservation plan or natural community	tandards are nt sources o nocturnal ar	more restrictive. The revisions a nimals. For the	re than the eare intended to se reasons, th	xisting Code, o preserve the is project will	

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
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?					
11a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – M	lineral Resou	irces)			
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing linclude any physical development, and therefore does not involve the project will have no impact on mineral resources, directly, indirectly, indirectly.	ne extraction	of mineral reso			
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?					
11b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources) No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. Therefore the project will not result in the loss of any mineral resource recovery sites, and will have no impact on mineral resources, directly, indirectly or cumulatively.					
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?					
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-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)					
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing li include any physical development, and therefore does not involve cor levels. The project will have no impact on the exposure of persons to City standards either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.	struction or a	ctivities that we	ould increase	ambient noise	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?					
12b. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-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, FPEIR Table 5.11-G – Vibration Source Levels For Construction Equipment, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)					
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing linelude any physical development, and therefore does not involve do in any exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne have no impact on the exposure of persons to the generation of excess either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.	evelopment, or vibration or	construction, or groundborne no	activities that oise levels. The	t would result ne project will	

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?				
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)				
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing li include any physical development, and therefore does not involve permanent increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.	e uses or act	ivities that wo	uld result in	a substantial
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
12d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction Conditions Report)	Equipment N	oise Levels, Ap	ppendix G – 1	Voise Existing
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. Therefore, the proposal does not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels above levels existing without the project, because the project does not involve activities such as construction, or other related temporary or long-term noise generating activities. The project will have no impact to ambient noise levels from temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels, either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
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?				
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 (1999), Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))				
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing linelude any physical development. The Code revisions will apply to code revision). There are properties subject to the Code revisions to (ALUCP); however, the proposed development standards are more reposed to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. The proposuch will not expose people residing or working within the proximity County Airport Land Use Commission has been provided a copy of ALUCP consistency prior to project approval by the City Council. The or cumulatively, on excessive noise levels.	all development hat lie withing estrictive that is all does not by to the airpoint the proposed	ent proposals in an Airport Lanthe existing Continuous and the existing Continuous and phart to excessive in revisions, and	n the City (i.e. nd Use Comp lode, especial ysical develo noise levels. ' will review a	, a "citywide" patibility Plan ly as it relates pment, and as The Riverside and determine ctly, indirectly
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?				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact
INFORMATION SOURCES):	Impact	With	Impact	ппрасс
		Mitigation Incorporated		
12f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Ai March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Compreh Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (A	ensive Land	Zones and Ing Use Plan (1)		
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing liconsists of physical development. The Code revisions will apply to a code revision). There are properties subject to the Code revisions to (ALUCP); however, the proposed development standards are more reto backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. Additionall has been provided a copy of the proposed revisions, and will review approval by the City Council. Because the proposal does not include people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels redirectly, indirectly or cumulatively.	all development that lie within estrictive that y, the Rivers: w and determent any physical	ent proposals in an Airport La an the existing C ide County Airp mine ALUCP c I development,	the City (i.e. nd Use Complete, especial port Land Use consistency put the project w	, a "citywide" patibility Plan ly as it relates e Commission rior to project ill not expose
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)?				
 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, SCAG's RCP and RTP) No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. Therefore the project does not propose new homes or businesses that would directly induce substantial population growth, and does not involve the addition of new roads or infrastructure that would indirectly induce substantial population growth This project will have no impact on population growth, either directly or indirectly. 				
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
13b. Response: No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. Therefore, the project will not displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No existing housing will be removed or affected by the proposed project, therefore, there will be no impact on existing housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes
13c. Response:				
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing liginclude any physical development. Therefore, the project will not replacement housing elsewhere. No existing housing or residents therefore, this project will have no impact on the displacement of perhousing, either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.	displace any will be remo	people, necessoved or affected	sitating the co	onstruction of bosed project;

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. PUBLIC SERVICES.		F		
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?				
 14a. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1) No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. Because the project does not include any physical development, it will not generate any substantial adverse physical impacts associated with governmental facilities and services, including fire protection. This project will not result in the intensification of land uses, and there will be no impact on the demand for additional fire facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. 				
b. Police protection?				
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing li include any physical development. Because the project does not include substantial adverse physical impacts associated with governmenta Adequate police facilities and services will not be affected by this prof land use, and there will be no impact on the demand for addition or cumulatively.	lude any phys al facilities a roject . This p	sical developme nd services, in project will not	ent, it will not acluding polic result in the i	t generate any ce protection. intensification ctly, indirectly
c. Schools?				
 14c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D – RUSD, Figure 5.13-3 – AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E – AUSD, Table 5.13-G – Student Generation for RUSD and AUSD By Education Level, and Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries) No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. Because the project does not include any physical development, it will not generate any substantial adverse physical impacts associated with governmental facilities and services, including schools. The project will not create or induce residential development, and will not involve the addition of any housing units or increase numbers of school age children. Therefore the project will have no impact on the demand for additional school facilities or services, either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. 				
d. Parks?				
 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) No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to existing lighting standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. Because the project does not include any physical development, it will not generate any substantial adverse physical impacts associated with governmental facilities and services, including parks. The project does not propose or induce residential development, and thus will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase the population or induce demands on park facilities. Therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional park facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. 				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
e. Other public facilities?		Incorporated		\boxtimes	
14e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure LU-8 – C	Community F		 IR Figure 5.		
Facilities, Figure 5.13-6 - Community Centers, Table 5.3-F - Riverside Community Centers, Table 5.13-H - Riverside Public Library Service Standards)					
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standard and does not include any physical development. Because the project generate any substantial adverse physical impacts associated with go create or induce residential development, and will not involve the industrial uses. The project will not increase demand for public factoriers. There will be no impacts on the demand for additional productively.	t does not incovernmental for addition of cilities and se	clude any physicacilities and ser acilities and ser any housing arvices, includir	cal development vices. The punits, comments are libraries are	ent, it will not roject will not ercial uses, or ad community	
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?					
 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) No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standards in the Zoning Code standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. Because the project does not include any physical development, it will not generate any substantial adverse physical impacts on neighborhood and regional park and recreation facilities. The project will not create or induce residential development, and will not involve the addition of any housing units, commercial uses, 					
or industrial uses. The project will not increase demand for purintensification of land use. There will be no impact on the demand indirectly or cumulatively.					
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?					
15b. Response:					
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standards in the Zoning Code standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development. Because the project does not include any physical development, it does not include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The project will not create or induce residential development, and will not involve the addition of any housing units, commercial uses, or industrial uses. The project will not increase demand for public facilities and services, and will not result in an intensification of land use. Therefore, there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on the environment as a result of adverse physical effects from proposed, induced, constructed or expanded recreational facilities.					

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?					
16a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG's RTP) No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standards in the Zoning Code standards to reduce light pollution, and does not include any physical development, the proposal					
does not increase in the intensity of use, and does not result in any m no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the capacity of the			Therefore, t		
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?					
16b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG's RTP)					
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standards and does not include any physical development. Because the project impact the level of service, travel demand, or other traffic standards Management Program (CMP). Therefore, there is no impact either the content of	does not incl ard as define	ude any physic d by the River	al developme side County	ent, it does not s Congestion	
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?					

		I		
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING	Potentially	Less Than	Less Than	No
^	Significant	Significant With	Significant	Impact
INFORMATION SOURCES):	Impact	Mitigation	Impact	
		Incorporated		
16c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 - A	rport Safety		fluence Area	s. RCALUCP.
March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehe				
Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (A			,	
	3 //			
No Impact. The project consists of proposed revisions to the lighting	standards to	reduce light po	ollution. The	proposal does
not include any physical development, and all projects proposed within the City will be subject to the new lighting				
regulations, which are more restrictive than the existing Code, espec				
from light sources. The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commiss				
and will review and determine ALUCP consistency prior to project				
development associated with the proposed project, it will not change				
the location of air traffic patterns. As such, this project will have no	mpact direct	ly, indirectly or	r cumulatively	y on air traffic
patterns and related safety risks.				
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g.,				\boxtimes
sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible				
uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
16d. Response:				
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standard	s in the Zonii	ng Code to redu	ce light pollu	tion, and does
not include any physical development. Because the project does not	include any	physical devel	opment, it do	es not include
any design features or incompatible uses that would substantially incr	ease hazards	. As such, the p	project will ha	ve no impact
related to traffic or circulation hazards, either directly, indirectly or c	umulatively.			
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				
16e. Response: (Source: California Department of Transporta	ation Highw	ay Design Mar	nual, Munici	pal Code, and
Fire Code)				
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standard				
not include any physical development. Because the project does no	t include any	physical devel	opment, the p	project cannot
create a physical impact that would limit or otherwise result in ina	dequate eme	ergency access;	therefore the	ere will be no
impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to emergency access.				
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding				\bowtie
public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise				<u> </u>
decrease the performance or safety of such facilities)?				
16f. Response: (Source: FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Use an	nd Urban Des	sign, Circulatio	on and Comm	unity Mobility
and Education Elements, Bicycle Master Plan, School Safe	ty Program -	– Walk Safe! –	Drive Safe!)	
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standard				
development. Furthermore, all projects proposed within the City v				
more restrictive than the existing Code, especially as it relates to l				
Because there is no physical development associated with the propos				
conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alterna				
such, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulative	vely on adop	ted policies, pla	ins, or prograi	ms supporting
alternative transportation.				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:					
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or 17a. Response: (AB52 Consultation)					
physical development. Because the project does not involve physic change in a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographic landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California due to the Legislative nature of the project, all tribes either declined interest in consultation. The project will have no impact directly, in cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size with cultural value to a California Native American tribe. b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	cally defined in Native Americal Consultation and irectly or consultation and irectly or consultation and irectly or consultation.	in terms of the strican tribe. The or did not responding the unulatively on	size and scope e tribes were ond to the req either a site,	e of the consulted and juest for feature, place,	
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standard physical development. Because the project does not involve physical adverse change in a resource of significance to a California Native Arrequirements of the Public Resources Code and due, to the nature of the request for consultation. The project will have no impact directly significance to a California Native American tribe. 18. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES.	d development merican tribe the project, de	nt of any land, i . The tribes we eclined consulta	t will not resure ere consulted pation or did no	alt in an pursuant to the ot respond to	
Would the project: a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?					
18a. 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)					
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standard development. Because there is no physical development associat treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board or cumulatively to wastewater treatment requirements or facilities.	ated with the	proposal, it w	vill not excee	ed wastewater	

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
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?					
18b. 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, FPEIR Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU Including Water Reliability for 2025, Table 5.16-I - Current and Projected Water Use WMWD, Table 5.16-J - General Plan Projected Water Demand for WMWD Including Water Reliability 2025, 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 5.16-4 – Water Facilities and Figure 5.16-6 – Sewer Infrastructure and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR.) No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standards in the Zoning Code, and does not include any physical development. Because there is no physical development associated with the proposal, it will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the project will					
have no impact resulting in the construction of new water or waste facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively. 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?					
18c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Faci	lities)				
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standards development. Because there is no physical development associate construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of impact resulting in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or cumulatively.	d with the present description of the description o	oposal, it will lities. Therefor	not require o	r result in the t will have no lities directly,	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?					
18d. 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) WMWD Table 5.16-I Current and Projected Water Use WMWD, Table 5.16-J – General Plan Projected Water Demand for WMWD Including Water Reliability 2025, RPU Master Plan, EMWD Master Plan, WMWD Master Plan, and Highgrove Water District Master Plan)					
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standard development. Because there is no physical development associated water supplies or require new entitlements or resources. Therefore, twater supplies either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.	d with the pro	oposal, the pro	ject will not a	affect existing	
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?					
18e. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 - Sewer Service A K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Ci					
Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Master Plan and Certified EIR)					

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standards in the Zoning Code, and does not include any physical development. Because there is no physical development associated with the proposal, it will not affect or exceed wastewater treatment requirements of (Regional Water Quality Control Board). Therefore, there are no impact to the wastewater treatment provider, directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.						
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?						
 18f. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.16-A – Existing Land) Generation from the Planning Area) No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standard development. Because there is no physical development associate capacity. Therefore, no impact to landfill capacity will occur direct. 	s in the Zonir	ng Code, and do	es not include	e any physical		
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?						
18g. Response: (Source: California Integrated Waste Managen	nent Board 2	002 Landfill F	acility Compi	liance Study)		
No Impact. The project consists of revisions to the lighting standard development. Because there is no physical development associar management of solid waste. Therefore, the proposed project would related to solid waste, and would have no impacts related to solid w	ted with the not conflict w	proposal, it wi	ll not affect , State, or loc	or impact the cal regulations		
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?						
19a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – S Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHO Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine A Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas, Figure Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D, Tia No Impact. The project consists of revision to the lighting standards development. The proposed development standards are more restr backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. The amendm light pollution, and thus would have beneficial effects on the quality there is no physical development associated with the proposal, the wildlife species, fish or wildlife population's ability to maintain set number or range of a rare or an endangered plant or animal importan	CP Cores and Area Plant Special Plant Specia	d Linkages, Fide Figure 5.4-4 - Les Survey Are Owl Survey Are and Pools, FP ochaeological of Riverside Munical Code, and do existing Code arther protect the nument for wild have no impact levels, the plant	gure OS-8 – MSHCP Critan, Figure 5.4 wear, MSHCP EIR Table 5 Sensitivity, Ficipal Code) es not included, especially and enight sky filife population to on the habit tor animal communication.	MSHCP Cells and 4-7 – MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - 5-A Historical Figure 5.5-2 - e any physical as it relates to rom excessive ns. Because at of a fish or ommunity, or in the section of the sec		
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project						

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
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)?						
19b. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 6 - Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program)						
No Impact. The project consists of revision to the lighting standards in the Zoning Code, and does not include any physical development. The proposed development standards are more restrictive than the existing Code, especially as it relates to backlighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. In addition, the project is consistent with General Plan 2025. Because there is no development associated with the project, and the development standards are the same or more restrictive on development proposals, there are no anticipated cumulative impacts of the proposed project beyond those previously considered. The proposal will have no impact in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.						
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?						
19c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program)						
No Impact. The project consists of revision to the lighting standards development. The proposed development standards are more restribacklighting, uplighting, and glare from light sources. Effects on hu quality, hydrology & water quality, noise, population and housing, I this initial study, and were found to have no impact. Based on the a will have no impact on human beings, directly or indirectly.	ictive than th man beings v nazards and h	e existing Code were evaluated azardous mater	e, especially as part of the rials, and traf	as it relates to aesthetics, air fic sections of		

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).