

RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA, CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE 2021–2029 PLANNING PERIOD HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE; A PUBLIC SAFETY ELEMENT UPDATE; ASSOCIATED ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE POLICIES INCLUDED IN BOTH ELEMENTS; AND ZONING CODE AND SPECIFIC PLAN UPDATES TO ADDRESS THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE 6TH REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) CYCLE; MAKING CERTAIN FINDINGS OF FACT RELATED THERETO, ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, ALL PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

WHEREAS, in order to comply with State law, City staff has undertaken the Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project which includes 1) adopting and implementing an update of the Housing Element for the 2021-2029 planning period; 2) adopting and implementing a Public Safety Element Update; 3) developing associated Environmental Justice Policies; and 4) updating the Zoning Code and Specific Plans to address the requirements of the 6th Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) cycle, all as evidenced in the ordinances and resolutions being adopted concurrently herewith (“Project”); and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), the State of California CEQA Guidelines (“State CEQA Guidelines”) (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15000 et seq.) and the City of Riverside (“City”) CEQA Guidelines (collectively “CEQA Regulations”) an Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) was prepared for the Project; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the requirements of Section 15082(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, on April 5, 2021, the City prepared and distributed a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) to all appropriate responsible and trustee agencies and to all organizations and individuals requesting notice, stating that an EIR would be prepared for the Project, beginning a 30-day scoping period; and

WHEREAS, on April 5, 2021, the NOP was sent to the State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2021040089); and

1 WHEREAS, on April 22, 2021, a public scoping meeting was virtually held in order to
2 assist with the initial the preparation of the EIR; and

3 WHEREAS, all responses to the NOP were considered in the preparation of the Draft EIR
4 and interested agencies and individuals were contacted to secure their input; and

5 WHEREAS, the Draft EIR was completed and a Notice of Completion (“NOC”) and the
6 Draft EIR was filed with the State Clearinghouse on July 19, 2021, in accordance with the
7 provisions of section 15085 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and

8 WHEREAS, copies of the Draft EIR were also sent to various public agencies,
9 organizations and individuals, made available at the City’s Planning Division, the Riverside Main
10 Library, Arlington Branch Library, Arlanza Branch Library, SSG Salvador J. Lara Casa Blanca
11 Branch Library, SPC Jesus S. Duran Eastside Library, La Sierra Branch Library, Orange Terrace
12 Branch Library, and on the City’s website, and a Notice of Availability (“NOA”) of the Draft EIR
13 was published in the Riverside Press Enterprise, a newspaper of general circulation, mailed to a
14 list of interested parties, and posted with the Riverside County Clerk’s Office; and

15 WHEREAS, the NOC and the NOA provided a 45-day public review period commencing
16 on July 19, 2021, and ending on September 2, 2021; and

17 WHEREAS, the City received written and oral comments from the public and responsible
18 agencies on the Draft EIR during and after the public comment period; and

19 WHEREAS, all comments on the Draft EIR concerning environmental issues that were
20 received during the public review period, as well as those received after the public review period,
21 were evaluated by the City as the Lead Agency in accordance with Section 15088 of the State
22 CEQA Guidelines; and

23 WHEREAS, the City Planning Commission held a duly noticed hearing on the Draft EIR
24 on September 9, 2021, and made certain recommendations to the City Council; and

25 WHEREAS, the Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”), dated September 2021, for
26 the Project consists of a Draft EIR dated July 2021, comments and recommendations received on
27 the Draft EIR, responses to comments on the Draft EIR, and list of persons, organizations and
28 public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR; and

1 WHEREAS, the FEIR contains the elements required by the CEQA Regulations, including,
2 but not limited to: (a) identification, description and discussion of all potentially significant
3 environmental effects of the proposed Project; (b) a description of mitigation measures proposed
4 to minimize potential significant environmental effects on the project identified in the FEIR; (c) a
5 description of those potential environmental effects which cannot be avoided or can be mitigated
6 but not to a level of insignificance; (d) a description of a range of reasonable alternatives to the
7 proposed Project and evaluation of the comparative merits and potential significant environmental
8 effects of the alternatives; (e) a discussion of cumulative impacts in accordance with the
9 requirements of section 15130 of the State CEQA Guidelines; (f) a discussion of growth inducing
10 impacts; (g) a discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes; (h) a discussion of
11 energy conservation; and (i) a list of all federal, state and local agencies, other organizations and
12 private individuals consulted in preparing the FEIR and the firm preparing the FEIR; and

13 WHEREAS, the FEIR includes comments received on the Draft EIR and written responses
14 to those comments, the focus of which is on the disposition of significant environmental issues
15 raised in the comments, as specified by CEQA Guidelines section 15088(b); and

16 WHEREAS, the City Council held a duly noticed hearing on the FEIR on October 5, 2021,
17 at which time additional written and oral testimony was received; and

18 WHEREAS, the City Council has been presented with and is familiar with the information
19 in the administrative record, including the Staff Reports and the written and verbal testimony
20 submitted thereon, and has reviewed and considered the information in the FEIR for completeness
21 and compliance with the CEQA Regulations, has independently reviewed and analyzed the FEIR
22 and has duly heard and considered the Staff Reports and all written and oral arguments presented
23 at its meeting of October 5, 2021; and

24 WHEREAS, the City has made the written findings set forth in Findings of Fact and
25 Statement of Overriding Considerations (“Findings/SOC”) attached hereto as Exhibit “A” and
26 incorporated herein by reference, for each potentially significant environmental impact identified
27 in the FEIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 based upon all of the evidence in
28 the administrative record, including, but not limited to the FEIR, written and oral testimony given

1 at meetings and hearings, and submission of testimony from the public, organizations and
2 regulatory agencies, and has determined that the Findings contain a complete and accurate
3 reporting of the environmental impacts and mitigation measures associated with the Project, as
4 well as complete and accurate reporting of the unavoidable impacts and benefits of the Project;
5 and

6 WHEREAS, approval of the Project will result in significant effects which are identified
7 in the FEIR that cannot be avoided or substantially lessened; and

8 WHEREAS, the City has stated in writing the specific reasons to support its action to
9 approve the Project, despite its significant environmental impacts, based on the FEIR and other
10 information in the record, including in the Findings/SOC set forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto;
11 and

12 WHEREAS, the City Council certifies that (1) the FEIR for the Project has been completed
13 in compliance with CEQA; (2) that the FEIR was presented to the City Council, and that the City
14 Council reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR prior to making a decision
15 on the Project; and (3) the FEIR reflects the City's independent judgment and analysis, and has
16 reviewed and considered all comments received during the public review process and at the public
17 hearings; and

18 WHEREAS, the City Council found that the Project identified in the FEIR incorporated
19 alterations or mitigation measures that avoid or substantially lessen potentially significant
20 environmental effects associated with the Project to the fullest extent feasible; and

21 WHEREAS, in accordance with the requirements of the CEQA Regulations, a Mitigation
22 Monitoring and Reporting Program was prepared that identified (i) all feasible measures required
23 to mitigate potentially significant impacts, and (ii) standards and requirements contained in
24 Ordinances and State Laws with which the Project will be required to comply, which Mitigation
25 Monitoring and Reporting Program is attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and incorporated herein by
26 reference; and

1 WHEREAS, the City has not received any comments or additional information that
2 constitutes substantial new information requiring recirculation under Public Resources Code
3 section 21092.1 and State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5; and

4 WHEREAS, all requirements of the CEQA Regulations have been satisfied by the City in
5 the EIR, which is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially significant environmental effects
6 of the Project have been adequately evaluated.

7 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Riverside,
8 California, and making the following findings, as follows:

9 Section 1: The above recitals are hereby found and determined to be true and correct and
10 are hereby incorporated herein as if stated in full.

11 Section 2: The City Council hereby makes the following findings and conclusions:

- 12 (a) The FEIR for the Project has been completed and processed in compliance with the
13 requirements of CEQA;
- 14 (b) The FEIR was presented to the City Council, and the City Council, as the decision-
15 making body for the City, reviewed and considered the information contained in
16 the FEIR and the administrative record as a whole, which includes, but is not
17 limited to, staff reports, testimony and information received, and scientific and
18 factual data presented in evidence during the review process, prior to approving the
19 Project; and
- 20 (c) The FEIR reflects the City's independent judgment and analysis.

21 Section 3: The City Council hereby finds that any changes to the FEIR in response to
22 comments received on the Draft EIR merely clarify, amplify or make insignificant modifications
23 to an already adequate EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(b) and that no
24 significant new information has been received that would require recirculation.

25 Section 4: The City Council finds that the Findings/SOC set forth in Exhibit "A," attached
26 hereto and incorporated by reference herein as if stated in full, are supported by substantial
27 evidence in the administrative record and are hereby adopted by the City Council.

28

1 Section 5: Potential environmental effects have been studied and, except as stated in
2 Section 8 below, there is no substantial evidence in the record, as a whole, that supports any
3 argument that the Project, as designed and mitigated, may cause a significant effect on the
4 environment. No facts, reasonable assumptions predicated on facts, testimony supported by
5 adequate factual foundation, or expert opinion supported by facts has been submitted that refute
6 the conclusions reached by the FEIR, studies, data and reports. Nor does anything in the record
7 alter the environmental determination, as presented, based upon investigation and independent
8 assessment of those studies, data and reports. No new significant impacts have been raised by any
9 commenting individual or entity, nor has any significant new information been added to the FEIR
10 that would require recirculation under State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5.

11 Section 6: The FEIR dated September, 2021, for the Project reflects the independent
12 judgment of the City based upon the findings and conclusions stated in the FEIR, staff reports, and
13 in consideration of testimony and information received, and scientific and factual data presented
14 in evidence during the review process.

15 Section 7: The City Council Finds that the FEIR dated September, 2021, has fully
16 examined the environmental impacts of the Project and, based on the information in the
17 administrative record, including the analysis in the FEIR, has determined that the impacts to
18 biological resources; cultural resources; paleontological resources; hazards and hazardous
19 materials; land use and planning; noise (noise near airports); public services; recreation;
20 transportation (conflict with transportation plans); tribal cultural resources; and, utilities and
21 service systems either have no impact, are less than significant or are potentially significant but
22 that with mitigation the impacts are reduced to less than significant based on the Findings/SOC set
23 forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, as well as the findings
24 and analysis contained in the FEIR (collectively "Findings"). The Findings are supported by
25 substantial evidence contained therein as well as in the record, and as such, said Findings are
26 hereby adopted by the City Council.

27 Section 8: The City Council finds that the FEIR dated September, 2021, has fully examined
28 the environmental concerns associated with the Project and, based on the information in the

1 administrative record, including the analysis in the FEIR, has determined that the following
2 significant impacts, identified in the FEIR, cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificant: air
3 quality, greenhouse gas emissions; noise (except for airport noise impacts); population and
4 housing; and, transportation (VMT). As explained in the Findings/SOC attached hereto as Exhibit
5 “A,” the City Council finds pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(3) that specific
6 economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible additional
7 mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen such impacts. The City Council
8 further finds, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(1) and as explained in the
9 Findings/SOC (Exhibit “A”) that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project
10 which mitigate or avoid those significant impacts identified in the FEIR to the fullest extent
11 feasible.

12 Section 9: With the exception of the impacts identified in Section 8 above, the City Council
13 finds that, the Project, including all mitigation measures, conditions, permits and approvals will
14 not have any other significant adverse unmitigated impacts on the environment. Potential
15 environmental effects have been studied and there is no substantial evidence in the record, as a
16 whole, that supports any argument that the Project, as designed and mitigated, would cause a
17 significant effect on the environment, except as to the impacts identified in Section 8. No facts,
18 reasonable assumptions predicated on facts, testimony supported by adequate factual foundation,
19 or expert opinion supported by facts has been submitted that refute the conclusions reached by the
20 FEIR, studies, data and reports. Nor does anything in the record alter the environmental
21 determination, as presented, based upon investigation and independent assessment of those studies,
22 data and reports

23 Section 10: The City Council finds that four (4) alternatives were considered and rejected
24 from further consideration as set forth in attached Exhibit “A” Findings/SOC. The City Council
25 further finds that four (4) other alternatives were identified and analyzed in the FEIR and all were
26 rejected as failing to meet most of the Project objectives and/or as infeasible, due to specific
27 economic, legal, social technological and other considerations. These grounds are contained in
28

1 the administrative record, including the FEIR, the Findings/SOC set forth in Exhibit “A” and the
2 written and verbal testimony. Specifically:

- 3 (a) Alternative 1 – No Project. This Alternative was rejected because even though it
4 could avoid the Project’s significant and unavoidable impacts, it fails to meet any
5 of the Project objectives and would be in direct conflict with California
6 Government Code section 65583 in identifying and providing for housing
7 opportunities.
- 8 (b) Alternative 2 – Dispersed Growth. This Alternative was rejected and determined
9 not to be feasible because it would not reduce the Project’s significant and
10 unavoidable impacts, and would not meet most or all of the Project Objectives.
- 11 (c) Alternative 3 – Focused Growth. This Alternative was rejected and determined not
12 to be feasible because although this Alternative would have reduced some impacts,
13 it does not meet all of the Project Objectives; in particular, this Alternative fails to
14 meet the critical objective of equitably providing housing opportunities across the
15 City, and only partially meets most others.
- 16 (d) Alternative 4 – Limited Opportunity Sites. This alternative was rejected and
17 determined not to be feasible because although this Alternative would have reduced
18 the severity of some impacts, it would also not meet one of the Project Objectives,
19 and only partially meet two others. Furthermore, it is infeasible in that it
20 compromises the City’s ability to meet its RHNA obligation, in that there is no
21 margin for sites which cannot be ultimately redesignated for unexpected, but
22 realistically possible reasons.

23 Section 11: The FEIR dated September, 2021, for the Project has been completed and
24 processed in compliance with the requirements of the CEQA Regulations (both state and local),
25 and based on the entirety of the administrative record is hereby certified.

26 Section 12: The City Council has balanced the benefits of the adoption of the Project
27 against its unavoidable environmental impacts and has determined that for the reasons set forth
28 below, the economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the Project outweigh the

1 unavoidable adverse environmental effects which have been identified in the Findings/SOC
2 attached as Exhibit “A” and the adverse environmental effects are therefore considered acceptable.
3 In making its determination, the City Council has indicated its intention to approve the Project and
4 hereby adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations contained in Exhibit “A” which sets
5 forth the considerations made by the City Council. The benefits of implementing and approving
6 the Project are summarized as follows:

7 (a) The Project would adopt an update of the Housing Element for the 2021–2029
8 planning period by the October 15, 2021, deadline; (2) adopt a Public Safety Element Update;
9 (3) develop associated Environmental Justice Policies; and (4) update the Zoning Code and
10 Specific Plans to address the requirements of the 6th RHNA cycle.

11 (b) The Project would implement the Housing Element of the General Plan, including
12 a Guiding Principle, Policies and Action Items, to provide the City with a coordinated and
13 comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing
14 throughout the community.

15 (c) The Project would comply with state law requirements for regular updates to the
16 Housing Element to ensure relevancy and accuracy, to be approved by the California Department
17 of Housing and Community Development before it can be put into effect, to ensure that the City
18 would be eligible for some of the state housing grants and funds it currently receives.

19 (d) The Project would implement the Public Safety Element of the General Plan,
20 including a Guiding Principle, Policies and Action Items, to provide the City with proactive
21 measures to reduce the risk of hazards and adequately, expediently, and efficiently responds to
22 immediate safety threats.

23 (e) The Project would comply with State law requirements for the update to the Public
24 Safety Element related to (1) AB 747 for revisions in concert with the Housing Element Update;
25 and (2) SB 1035 for inclusion of new information related to fire and flood hazards and climate
26 adaptation and resiliency strategies.

27 (f) The Project would integrate and implement Environmental Justice Policies and
28 Action Items into the existing elements of the General Plan (1) to address issues related to public

1 health, social equity and environmental justice; and (2) reduce health risks, promoting civic
2 engagement, and prioritizing the needs of disadvantaged communities in the community.

3 (g) The Project would comply with California Government Code Section 65302 that
4 requires jurisdictions with environmental justice communities to incorporate environmental justice
5 policies into their general plans and address ways that environmental justice communities are
6 protected from environmental and health hazards when a jurisdiction adopts the general plan or
7 revises two or more elements concurrently.

8 (h) The Project would develop a predevelopment checklist (environmental
9 development checklist) to support the development review process for applicants proposing
10 development of individual Opportunity Sites that are consistent with the Project.

11 (i) The Project would plan for a maximum allowable development under the Project
12 (31,564 units) to meet the City's minimum RHNA obligation (18,458 units with a 30 percent No
13 Net Loss buffer for approximately 24,000 units) across all wards.

14 (j) The Project would affirmatively further fair housing and identify potential
15 environmental justice and social equity issues to support positive economic, educational, and
16 health outcomes for low-income families—particularly long-term outcomes for children.

17 (k) The Project would ensure affordable housing is added across the City and not
18 concentrated in areas with lower access to amenities or near sources of pollution.

19 (l) The Project would add a variety of housing opportunities that will make Riverside
20 a more accessible and resilient community.

21 (m) The Project would locate new housing in areas readily accessible to services, parks
22 and other amenities, transit, jobs, and activity centers.

23 (n) The Project would identify vacant or under-developed sites, meaning sites with
24 substantial unused land or development potential.

25 (o) The Project would limit or prevent housing development in areas with development
26 constraints, such as agricultural and conservation lands, airport influence areas, and, to the extent
27 feasible, fire and flood hazard zones.

28

1 (p) The Project would address the public safety and public health needs and concerns
2 of its residents, businesses, institutions, and visitors, and set forth a proactive and coordinated
3 program of protection for all foreseeable natural and human-caused hazards.

4 (q) The Project would reduce the potential adverse impacts of housing near
5 incompatible land uses, along major corridors, or near similar uses.

6 These findings are supported by substantial evidence and the data to support these
7 overriding considerations are found throughout the FEIR, the supporting comments and responses
8 section of the FEIR, and by information throughout the administrative record.

9 Section 13: The City Council finds that all significant environmental impacts from
10 implementation of the Project have been identified in the FEIR and, with the implementation of
11 the mitigation measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program contained
12 in Exhibit “B” attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, will be mitigated to a less-
13 than-significant level, with the exception of the impacts identified in Section 8 above. The City
14 Council hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project to
15 implement the policies, goals and implementation measures identified in the FEIR as necessary to
16 preclude the need for further mitigation measures. Said Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting
17 Program, contained in the FEIR and attached hereto as Exhibit “B”, is hereby incorporated as part
18 of the approval of the City Council for the adoption of the Project.

19 Section 14: Specific environmental, economic, social, legal, technical and other
20 considerations and benefits derived from the development of the Project override and make
21 infeasible any alternative to the Project or further mitigation measures beyond those incorporated
22 into this Project.

23 Section 15: The City Council hereby finds that the locations of documents and other
24 materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which its decision is based are the
25 Community & Economic Development Department, Planning Division and the City Clerk’s Office
26 located at 3900 Main Street, Riverside, California 92522, and the custodian of such records shall
27 be the Community & Economic Development Director and the City Clerk, respectively.

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ADOPTED by the City Council this _____ day of _____, 2021.

PATRICIA LOCK DAWSON
Mayor of the City of Riverside

DONESIA GAUSE
City Clerk of the City of Riverside

I, Donesia Gause, City Clerk of the City of Riverside, California, hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly and regularly introduced at a meeting of the City Council on the ____ day of _____, 2021, by the following vote, to wit:

- Ayes:
- Noes:
- Abstain:
- Absent:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Riverside, California, this ____ day of _____, 2021.

DONESIA GAUSE
City Clerk of the City of Riverside

**CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT, STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

This document includes the following sections:

- I. Introduction to CEQA Findings of Fact
- II. Location and Custodian of the Record
- III. Findings for Impacts Identified as Significant but Mitigated to a Less than Significant Level
- IV. Findings for Impacts that are Significant and Unavoidable
- V. Findings Regarding Cumulative Impacts
- VI. Findings Regarding Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes
- VII. Findings Regarding Growth Inducing Impacts
- VIII. Findings Regarding Alternatives
- IX. Findings Regarding No Need for Recirculation
- X. Statement of Overriding Considerations
- XI. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

I. INTRODUCTION TO CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

These Findings of Fact are made pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] §21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs. title 14, §15000 et seq.) by the City of Riverside (City), as the lead agency for the Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project (Project). These Findings of Fact pertain to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), State Clearinghouse #2021040089.

A. PROJECT LOCATION

The Project site is the City. The City is bounded on the north by the Santa Ana River and the cities of Jurupa Valley, Colton, and Rialto (San Bernardino County); on the south by the unincorporated communities of Woodcrest and Mockingbird Canyon; on the north and east by the unincorporated community of Highgrove and the city of Moreno Valley; and on the west by the unincorporated community of Home Gardens and the cities of Norco and Corona. The City's existing corporate boundaries include approximately 51,310 gross acres. The Northern Sphere of Influence (SOI) encompasses approximately 4,088 gross acres—from the existing City limits to the San Bernardino County line and east to the Box Springs Mountain Regional Park—and includes the Highgrove community. The Southern SOI encompasses approximately 36,826 gross acres and extends from the City's southern border to the Cajalco Ridge crest, just south of Cajalco Road. The area includes the communities of El Sobrante, Glen Valley, and Woodcrest, and limited portions of Gavilan Hills and Lake Mathews. Overall, the City's Planning Area encompasses approximately 92,224 gross acres.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

The Project would include (1) adopting and implementing an update of the Housing Element for the 2021–2029 planning period; (2) adopting and implementing a Public Safety Element Update; (3) developing associated Environmental Justice Policies included in both element updates; and (4) updating the Zoning Code and Specific Plans to address the requirements of the 6th Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) cycle. The Project is intended to accommodate the City’s RHNA obligation of 18,458 dwelling units (DUs), plus approximately 30 percent (approximately 5,500 DUs) to comply with Senate Bill (SB) 166 (No Net Loss) requirements, for an overall goal of 24,000 DUs.

The Housing Element Update addresses changes that have occurred since adoption of the 5th cycle (2013–2021) Housing Element. These changes include updated demographic information, housing needs data, and analysis of the availability sites for potential future housing development (Opportunity Sites). The locations of available Opportunity Sites in the Housing Element have been updated to identify sites that accommodate the City’s RHNA for the 2021–2029 planning period (6th cycle). The Project would also amend the *Riverside General Plan 2025* (GP 2025) land use and Specific Plan designations and rezone sites to accommodate the changes specified in the Housing Element Update. The Project involves 239 acres that do not require zoning changes and 581 acres that would require general plan amendments, Zoning Code changes, and Specific Plan amendments, for a total of 870 parcels comprising 820 acres. The implementation of this Project could result in an increase of 31,564 new DUs and 3,181,930 square feet of nonresidential development, or up to 31,175 DUs and 1,433,460 square feet over existing conditions.

The Project also includes an update to the Public Safety Element to incorporate information on natural and human-caused hazards, along with new policies related to environmental justice, climate change, and pandemic preparedness and response, among others. The purpose of the Public Safety Element is to reduce the potential short- and long-term risk of death, injuries, property damage, and economic and social disruption resulting from fires, floods, droughts, earthquakes, landslides, climate change, and other hazards. Other locally relevant safety issues—such as emergency response, hazardous material spills, crime reduction, and response to global pandemics like COVID-19—are included. The Public Safety Element must identify hazards and ways to reduce those hazards to guide local decisions related to zoning and development regulations. Policies and implementable actions include methods for minimizing risks, as well as ways to minimize economic disruption and speed up recovery following disaster.

The Project includes a series of proposed GP 2025 policies and implementing actions that promote environmental justice within the City. *Environmental justice* is “the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of laws, regulations, and policies.” To address disproportionate effects and to comply with SB 1000, policies and actions are incorporated within each element of GP 2025, with the goal of affording affected communities an equal level of protection from environmental and health hazards and enhanced opportunities to engage in decision-making that affects environmental quality and health outcomes.

C. PROCEDURAL COMPLIANCE WITH CEQA

The City published a Draft EIR on July 19, 2021, for a 45-day public review period ending on September 2, 2021, and completed a Final EIR in compliance with CEQA requirements. As allowed for in State CEQA Guidelines §15084(d)(2), the City retained consultants to assist with the preparation of the environmental documents. Acting as lead agency, the City has directed, reviewed, and edited as necessary all material prepared by the consultants, and such material reflects the City’s independent judgment. In general, the preparation of the EIR included the following key steps and public notification efforts.

- A 30-day scoping process began with the City's issuance of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR on April 5, 2021. The NOP was filed with the State Clearinghouse on April 5, 2021, which started a 30-day comment period that ended May 5, 2021. The City noticed and held an EIR scoping meeting during the 30-day comment period to receive perspective and input from agencies, organizations and individuals on the scope and content of the environmental information to be addressed in the EIR. The EIR scoping meeting was held virtually on April 22, 2021.
- The City issued the Draft EIR by filing a Notice of Completion with the State Clearinghouse on July 19, 2021. The Notice of Availability for the Draft EIR was published in the Press Enterprise and distributed to a variety of government agencies, organizations and interested parties, including: local jurisdictions, tribal governments, state and federal agencies, resource agencies, water districts and boards, transportation agencies, community groups and organizations, business organizations, chambers of commerce, universities and school districts, senior/aging organizations, interested parties and members of the public. The Draft EIR was also posted on the City's website and made available for review at City Hall and eight public libraries throughout the City, including the Riverside New Main Library, Arlington Library, Arlanza Public Library, SSgt. Salvador J. Lara Casa Blanca Library, SPC. Jesus S. Duran Eastside Library, La Sierra Library, Marcy Branch Library, Orange Terrace Library, and the City of Riverside Community and Economic Development Department, Planning Division public counter at Riverside City Hall.
- The Draft EIR was available for a 45-day public review period beginning July 19, 2021, and ending September 2, 2021. The City held a public Planning Commission hearing on September 9, 2021, which discussed findings and information within the Draft EIR.
- Following close of the public review period, the City revised the Draft EIR in response to comments received during the public review period and provided written responses addressing all significant environmental issues raised. Revisions made to the Draft EIR are shown throughout the Final EIR in strikethrough and underline text.
- As part of its Final EIR, the City responded to all timely written comments on the Draft EIR and provided written responses to all public agencies that timely commented on the Draft EIR, consistent with the legal requirement that such agencies be provided written responses at least 10 days prior to any lead agency action to certify the EIR. A public City Council hearing was held on October 5, 2021, to consider certification of the Final EIR and approval of the Project.

D. INCORPORATION OF FINAL EIR BY REFERENCE

The Final EIR is hereby incorporated by reference into these Findings of Fact. The Final EIR consists of three volumes:

1. Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR (Vol. I)
2. Text Revisions to the Draft EIR (Vol. I)
3. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Vol. I)
4. Draft EIR, July 2021 (Vol. II)
5. Draft EIR Appendices, July 2021 (Vol. III)

E. REQUIREMENTS FOR CEQA FINDINGS

Pursuant to PRC §21081 and State CEQA Guidelines §15091, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified, which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment

that would occur if the project is approved or carried out, unless the public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant impact.

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR.

For purposes of the third of these possible findings, the State CEQA Guidelines define “feasible” as “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors” (State CEQA Guidelines §15364). Therefore, a decision-making body may reject a mitigation measure or project alternative as infeasible if the measure or alternative fails to meet this definition. Importantly, the courts understand the legal concept of infeasibility to encompass both (i) the ineffectiveness of a particular alternative or mitigation measure in promoting the agency’s underlying project purpose and objectives and (ii) the desirability of the measure or alternative from a policy standpoint, as reasonably determined by the decision makers. (See *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417; *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1000-1001; *San Diego Citizenry Group v. County of San Diego* (2013) 2129 Cal.App.4th 1, 17-18.)

The City has made one or more of these specific written findings regarding each significant impact associated with the Project. Those findings are presented below, along with a presentation of facts in support of the findings. The City certifies that these findings are based on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these findings, concerning the environmental issues identified and discussed. These findings are based on substantial evidence contained in the totality of the administrative record before the City, including, but not limited to, the Final EIR supporting evidence cited herein.

A full explanation of the environmental findings, conclusions, and mitigation measures referenced herein can be found in the Draft EIR and Final EIR; and these Findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussions and analyses in those documents. In making these Findings, the City hereby ratifies, adopts, and incorporates those discussions and analyses, adopting them as the City’s own.

II. LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the City’s Findings of Fact are based are located at 3900 Main Street, Riverside, California. The custodian of these documents is the Community & Economic Development Director and the City Clerk. This information is provided in compliance with PRC § 21081.6(a)(2) and State CEQA Guidelines § 15091(e).

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings of Fact, the Record of Proceedings for the Project consists of the following documents, among others:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the City and in conjunction with the Project.
- The Draft and Final EIRs, including appendices and technical studies included or referenced in the Draft and Final EIRs.

- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public comment period on the Draft EIR.
- All comments and correspondence submitted to the City with respect to the Project.
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project.
- All Findings and resolutions adopted by the City decision makers in connection with the Project and all documents cited or referred to therein.
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents related to the Project prepared by ICF, Inc., consultants to the City.
- All documents and information submitted to the City by responsible, trustee, or other public agencies, or by individuals or organizations, in connection with the Project, up through the date that the City approved the Project.
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the City at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings.
- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including but not limited to applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings of Fact, in addition to those cited above.
- Any other materials required to be in the Record of Proceedings by PRC § 21167.6(e).

III. FINDINGS FOR IMPACTS IDENTIFIED AS SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

The City Council hereby finds that the following mitigation measures, which are identified in the EIR and will reduce the following otherwise significant environmental impacts to a less-than-significant level, have been required in or incorporated into the Project. ***The findings below are for impacts where implementation of the Project would result in significant environmental impacts that would be reduced to less than significant following mitigation. These findings are based on the discussion of impacts in the detailed impact analyses in Section 3.1 through Section 3.16 of the EIR, as well as relevant responses to comments in the Final EIR.***

Except where specifically otherwise noted below, the following statutory finding applies to all of the impacts described in this section (III):

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate the significant effects on the environment (to less-than-significant levels) (see PRC § 21081(a)(1)).

The potentially significant impacts, and the Mitigation Measures that will reduce them to a less-than-significant level, are as follows:

A. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact BIO-1: The Project could 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Finding: The Project would have impacts on special-status species. However, the impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1**.

Explanation:

Although future development projects facilitated by the Project could result in the removal and/or disturbance of suitable habitat for special-status species, and direct and indirect impacts on individuals, and Opportunity Site projects that are not eligible for the ministerial approval process (and are projects per CEQA), implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** would avoid or minimize any potential impacts on special-status plant and/or animal species. Because the City is a permittee in the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRC MSHCP), each individual development project would go through the WRC MSHCP consistency review process to ensure that it is consistent with the requirements of the plan and, as described in Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1**, would implement additional project-specific mitigation as needed. The WRC MSHCP consistency review for specific developments may include habitat assessments and protocol surveys for riparian bird species, habitat assessments and focused surveys for burrowing owl, surveys for amphibians and mammals, habitat assessments and protocol surveys for listed fairy shrimp species, and quantification of impacts on coastal sage scrub suitable habitat for coastal California gnatcatcher. The methods and results of any required survey would be provided to the Regional Conservation Authority and wildlife agencies for any impacts within Riparian/Riverine areas or Cell areas as part of the WRC MSHCP consistency review. Consistency with the WRC MSHCP would ensure that impacts on sensitive or listed species would be mitigated on a biologically equivalent basis. Consequently, impacts on special-status species would be less than significant with implementation of this measure and individual project-specific consistency with the WRC MSHCP.

Reference: Section 3.2.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's biological resources impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measure.

MM-BIO-1: Conduct literature review, habitat assessment, and surveys.

Preliminary Review: Prior to construction on Opportunity Sites that are vacant or where the potential presence of biological or aquatic resources exists, a consistency review shall be performed to ensure that the project is consistent with the requirements of the WRC MSHCP. For the project-specific WRC MSHCP consistency process, the applicant shall employ a qualified biologist approved by the City to review the future Opportunity Site project. The qualified biologist shall conduct a site-specific literature review, which shall consider, at a minimum, the future development project, site location, GIS information, WRC MSHCP survey areas and requirements, and known sensitive biological resources. The review shall assess the site for special-status plants and/or wildlife, aquatic resources, sensitive natural communities, wildlife corridors or nurseries, or other regulated biological resources covered by the WRC MSHCP and/or pursuant to CEQA, FESA, or CESA that could be affected by the project. In some cases, a

literature review would be sufficient for the biologist to make a no impact and/or a less-than-significant impact determination for all six of the thresholds of significance (Section 3.2.4) of biological resources and/or the determination that the project is consistent with the WRC MSHCP. In this case, no further work shall be required, and if deemed necessary by the City, a summary report stating the basis for these findings, identifying each threshold of significance with a CEQA finding, shall be the only requirement.

Habitat Assessment Survey: If, during the preliminary review, it is determined that potential biological resources including any species covered under the MSHCP exist on the individual Opportunity Site that could be affected, then a habitat assessment survey shall be required unless a qualified biologist determines that a field review/habitat assessment is not needed. If needed, and/or the project is in a WRC MSHCP designated survey area, this survey shall consist of a site visit conducted by a qualified biologist, where the proposed individual development project and adjacent buffer (as appropriate for the target species relative to the potential project direct and indirect impacts) shall be assessed for WRC MSHCP covered species and habitats; candidate, sensitive, or special-status plants and/or wildlife; aquatic resources; sensitive natural communities; and wildlife corridors or nurseries while identifying and mapping all vegetation communities and land-cover types. If suitable habitat is present for candidate, sensitive, or special-status plants or animals and cannot be avoided, then focused protocol surveys may be required, as determined by the qualified biologist, with appropriate reporting. If aquatic resources are present and cannot be avoided, a jurisdictional delineation may be required. Mitigation shall include an analysis of all the biological resources identified in the thresholds of significance, with a determination made regarding significance for each threshold. Reporting shall include regulatory assessment, impact analyses, and identification and implementation of appropriate measures based on the presence of biological resources.

Reduce and Avoid Impacts: If, following the literature review and surveys for Opportunity Sites, it is determined that the site would not directly or indirectly affect any WRC MSHCP covered species or habitats; candidate, sensitive, or special-status plants and/or wildlife; aquatic resources; sensitive natural communities; or wildlife corridors or nurseries, then no further action or WRC MSHCP consistency analysis shall be required. If, however, it is determined that impacts on WRC MSHCP covered species or habitats; candidate, sensitive, or special-status plants and/or wildlife; aquatic resources; sensitive natural communities; or wildlife corridors or nurseries would occur and therefore would be considered significant, then additional mitigation measures as recommended by the qualified biologist and approved by the Planning Division shall be implemented to avoid or reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

Impact BIO-2: The Project could have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Finding: The Project would be inconsistent with individual project-specific consistency with the WRC MSHCP. However, the impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1**.

Explanation:

Although future development under the Housing Element Update and Zoning Code and Specific Plan amendments could result in the removal and/or disturbance of sensitive natural communities, and Opportunity Site projects that are not eligible for the ministerial approval process (and are projects per CEQA), implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** would avoid or minimize any potential impacts on sensitive natural communities. Because the City is a permittee in the WRC MSHCP, each individual development project would go through the WRC MSHCP consistency review process to ensure that it is consistent with the requirements of the plan and, as described in Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1**, would implement additional project-specific mitigation to achieve biological equivalency pursuant to the plan, as needed. Consequently, impacts on sensitive natural communities would be less than significant with implementation of this measure and individual project-specific consistency with the WRC MSHCP.

Reference: Section 3.2.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's biological resources impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** and individual project-specific consistency with the WRC MSHCP, as described under Impact BIO-1.

Impact BIO-3: The Project could have a substantial adverse effect on state- or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means

Finding: The Project would have an adverse impact on protected wetlands. However, the impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1**.

Explanation:

Although future development facilitated by the Project could result in the removal and/or disturbance of WRC MSHCP-designated Riparian/Riverine habitats, wetlands, and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources, and Opportunity Site projects that are not eligible for the ministerial approval process (and are projects per CEQA), implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** would avoid or minimize any potential impacts on WRC MSHCP-designated Riparian/Riverine habitats, wetlands, and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources. Because the City is a permittee in the WRC MSHCP, each individual development project would go through the WRC MSHCP consistency review process to ensure that it is consistent with the requirements of the plan and, as described in Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1**, would implement additional project-specific mitigation, as needed. Consequently, impacts on WRC MSHCP-designated Riparian/Riverine habitats, wetlands, and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources would be less than significant with implementation of this measure and individual project-specific consistency with the WRC MSHCP. In addition, implementation of the Statewide NPDES Construction General Permit and construction site best management practices (BMPs) outlined in the Project's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan would reduce construction-related indirect impacts on wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources from erosion, sedimentation, and pollution.

Reference: Section 3.2.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's biological resources impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** and individual project-specific consistency with the WRC MSHCP, as described under Impact BIO-1.

Impact BIO-4: The Project could 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.

Finding: The Project could impact nesting birds. However, the impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1**.

Explanation:

There are trees, shrubs, and structures throughout the City, including within the Opportunity Sites, that could provide suitable habitat for nesting birds, including raptors, protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or California Fish and Game Code sections. Construction of future development has the potential to impact active native resident and/or migratory bird nests if, and to the extent that, those trees and shrubs are trimmed or removed, or the structures are demolished, during the avian nesting season and they contain nests. Construction could also occur adjacent to active nests causing nest failures or abandonment.

Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** would avoid or minimize any potential impacts on nesting birds and WRC MSHCP specific planning species as a result of any future development under the Housing Element Update and Zoning Code amendments. Because the City is a permittee in the WRC MSHCP, each individual development project would go through the WRC MSHCP consistency review process to ensure that it is consistent with the requirements of the plan and, as described in Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1**, would implement additional project-specific mitigation, as needed. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated and individual project-specific consistency with the WRC MSHCP.

Reference: Section 3.2.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's biological resources impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** and individual project-specific consistency with the WRC MSHCP, as described under Impact BIO-1.

Impact BIO-5: The Project could conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Finding: The Project could conflict with the WRC MSHCP by removing habitat from its conservation areas. However, the impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1**.

Explanation:

Construction of future development may remove habitat within WRC MSHCP conservation areas. To compensate for any loss of conservation areas in the WRC MSHCP, Project applicants must coordinate with the wildlife agencies and Regional Conservation Authority to develop a mitigation plan that demonstrates biological equivalency to offset any losses and to ensure that the Project is consistent with the WRC MSHCP. Any activity associated with individual development projects that occurs within the boundaries of the WRC MSHCP would comply and be consistent with the policies, goals, objectives, and conservation measures of the WRC MSHCP. Because the specific details of future development projects facilitated by the Project are not known at this time, the exact impacts on WRC MSHCP conservation areas resulting from construction activities cannot be predicted. Quantitative analysis of the exact areas, acreages, and protected resources under the WRC MSHCP to be affected by each future development would be performed at a project-by-project level during each project's independent development review process to ensure consistency with the WRC MSHCP. Implementation of

Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** and compliance with the WRC MSHCP would reduce any potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Reference: Section 3.2.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the project's biological resources impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** and individual project-specific consistency with the WRC MSHCP, as described under Impact BIO-1.

B. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact CUL-1: The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

Finding: The Project could impact a historical resource during construction in areas unsurveyed. However, the impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-1**.

Explanation:

While much of the City has been surveyed and studied, potential significance of much of the City's remaining built environment and designed landscapes remains unknown. Therefore, a potential historical resource (including, but not limited to, resources 50 years of age or older, consistent with California Register of Historical Resources [CRHR] and National Register of Historic Places [NRHP] guidelines and pursuant to Section 15064.5) could be present on an Opportunity Site outside of a previously surveyed area. For proposed development on a property that meets the following three criteria, implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-1** would result in no impacts.

Reference: Section 3.3.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's cultural resources impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures.

MM-CUL-1: Conduct a historical resource assessment.

The individual applicants shall hire a Secretary of the Interior-qualified historic preservation professional to conduct a historical resource assessment if a structure to be affected by a subsequent development project, at the time of application, is not in a previously surveyed area, is not a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, and is at least 50 years old. The assessment shall formally evaluate the potential resource's eligibility for listing to the CRHR, its potential eligibility as a Landmark or Structure of Merit, and its potential eligibility as a Contributor to a Historic District or Neighborhood Conservation Area. If the resource is found eligible for any of those designations, it shall be considered a resource that qualifies as a historical resource under CEQA and is therefore subject to the provisions of the Cultural Resources Ordinance. This includes obtaining the pertinent Certificates of Appropriateness and ensuring that the project plans adhere to the SOI Standards. For resources found ineligible for any of those designations, no additional mitigation would be necessary.

Impact CUL-2: The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

Finding: The Project could impact an archaeological resource. However, the impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-CUL-2** through **MM-CUL-9**.

Explanation:

Most of the Opportunity Sites associated with this Project are in areas of unknown archaeological sensitivity, while a smaller number of these sites are in areas of low to high archaeological sensitivity. The locations with unknown archaeological sensitivity are areas where archaeological studies had not been conducted at the time of the 2007 analysis. Because the Opportunity Sites under the proposed Housing Element Update are situated throughout the City and in mostly unsurveyed areas, the potential for Opportunity Sites to encounter archaeological resources is unknown. Future cultural resources/archaeological studies at Opportunity Site locations (see Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-2**) would identify whether such resources exist.

Development of Opportunity Sites could potentially include the excavation of soils in undeveloped areas and demolition of standing structures in developed areas. Excavation and demolition activities could result in the discovery of previously unidentified archaeological resources and the destruction of known archaeological resources if they have been identified through cultural resources studies.

Therefore, ground-disturbing activities could result in the discovery of previously unidentified archaeological resources and the destruction of known archaeological resources, which would be a potentially significant impact. For Opportunity Site projects that require CEQA analysis (non-ministerial projects), implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-2** would reduce this impact to less-than-significant levels. If archaeological resources are discovered during an archaeological study, or if archaeological resources are identified as inadvertent discoveries during ground-disturbing activities, then Mitigation Measures **MM-CUL-3** through **MM-CUL-9** would reduce this impact to less-than-significant levels. Not all projects would require Mitigation Measures **MM-CUL-3** through **MM-CUL-9**, as these mitigation measures are only applicable if archaeological resources are discovered during an archaeological study or as unanticipated discoveries.

Reference: Section 3.3.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's cultural resources impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures.

MM-CUL-2: Conduct an archaeological study.

For Opportunity Site development projects that require CEQA analysis (non-ministerial projects), prior to construction, and if it is determined that the development project will involve ground disturbance of some type, the applicant shall conduct an archaeological study. This study will be conducted during project-specific CEQA analyses at Opportunity Sites that have not been studied in such a manner in the previous 5 years. The archaeological study shall follow the guidelines set forth by the City of Riverside Community & Economic Development Department in the document titled *Consultant Requirements for Cultural Resources Survey, Studies and Reports Information Sheet* or successor document.

The cultural resources archaeological recommendations shall be valid for 5 years after the date of the record search. After 5 years, the applicant shall retain an archaeologist who shall acquire an updated

record search from the Eastern Information Center and review the cultural resources technical report recommendations.

For proposed development locations where only a record search and/or a site visit have already been conducted prior to this EIR, the project applicant shall retain an archaeologist to:

- Review record search results, site visit results, and any recommendations.
- Obtain an updated record search from the Eastern Information Center if the record search is older than 5 years.
- Review available historic maps, historic aerials, and other archival materials.
- Prepare a cultural resources memo with existing or updated record search results; a summary of background research of historic maps, aerials, etc.; and potential for historic and prehistoric archaeological resources to be present at the proposed development location. Additionally, the memo shall identify potential impacts and provide recommendations.

The City shall review these findings and make a determination regarding the significance of project-level impacts prior to approval of any future development. Should the archaeological study result in the identification of archaeological resources on the proposed development site, or should unanticipated discoveries of previously unknown archaeological resources be made during ground-disturbing activities at an Opportunity Site, Mitigation Measures **MM-CUL-3** through **MM-CUL-6** would be applicable.

MM-CUL-3: Avoid archaeological sites through establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs).

If archaeological resources are identified either through an archaeological study or as unanticipated discoveries during construction, implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-3** would be required. Avoidance is always the preferred method of treatment for archaeological sites. Additionally, should sacred objects or objects of religious importance to Native American tribes be identified, preservation in place avoids conflicts with traditional values of tribes who ascribe meaning to these resources and their locations. Impacts on cultural resources can be avoided through establishing fencing around cultural resources with a buffer and delineating these locations as ESAs. The appropriate buffer size shall be delineated upon consultation with Native American tribes and the City (for prehistoric resources). The City and the consultant archaeologist for individual development projects shall determine appropriate buffers for historical-period (non-Native American) archaeological resources on a case-by-case basis based on the known extent of archaeological sites and the relationship to proposed ground disturbance.

MM-CUL-4: Develop and implement an Archaeological Treatment Plan (ATP) for evaluation of newly discovered and/or unevaluated archaeological resources.

Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-4** shall apply as follows:

- The results of an archaeological study conducted under Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-2** are unable to determine the eligibility of newly identified archaeological sites for inclusion to the CRHR and it is determined by the consulting archaeologist that additional study through Phase II testing is required;

- It is not possible to avoid impacts through the establishment of ESAs; or
- Unanticipated archaeological resources are discovered during construction on Opportunity Sites.

If it is necessary to properly evaluate such properties in such a manner, an ATP shall be developed that describes methods and procedures for conducting subsurface excavations to determine the vertical and horizontal extents of an archaeological site. The ATP shall define the parameters of archaeological testing at the site and the extent of excavation and analysis of any materials recovered. The ATP shall also include guidelines for treatment and curation of any materials recovered during the testing process. Subsequent to implementation of the ATP, a technical report describing the methods and results of archaeological testing and formal evaluations of the archaeological sites and recommendations for further treatment shall be completed. The ATP shall be approved by the City and should involve consultation and review by Native American tribes consulting on the proposed development project. An ATP shall only be necessary for newly discovered archaeological sites that require additional information to make determinations of eligibility.

MM-CUL-5: Implement data recovery for CRHR-eligible sites that cannot be avoided.

If archaeological studies identify a cultural resource as being potentially eligible for listing in the CRHR and ESAs cannot be established or project design cannot be altered, resulting in impacts on the site, then a Phase III data recovery program shall be developed, when mutually agreed upon by Native American representatives (for prehistoric or historic-period Native American sites) and the City. The data recovery program shall be outlined in a Data Recovery Treatment Plan that details the procedures and objectives for mitigation of impacts on the archaeological site. The Data Recovery Treatment Plan shall include a research design with testable hypotheses and data requirements necessary to address these hypotheses. Additionally, the Data Recovery Treatment Plan shall identify methods of excavation, analysis, and curation of any archaeological materials recovered. The Data Recovery Treatment Plan shall also identify the treatment of any human remains discovered during data recovery procedures. If the archaeological resource is Native American (prehistoric or historic-period in age), then the City, the applicant, and the archaeologist shall engage in consultation so that Native American representatives can be involved in the development of the data recovery plan.

Data recovery shall involve analysis of a representative sample of the materials recovered during excavation. For prehistoric archaeological sites, all excavations should be monitored by a representative from a geographically appropriate Native American group. At the conclusion of the data recovery program, a data recovery technical report shall be completed detailing the results of the excavations and analysis. Curation of recovered archaeological materials shall be conducted per the guidance in the Data Recovery Treatment Plan and with consultation between the City and appropriate Native American tribes. Other forms of mitigation could include additional research with archival sources, landscape studies, designation of open space, public outreach programs, and public education/public displays.

MM-CUL-6: Retain an on-call archaeologist for monitoring.

For Opportunity Site development projects that require CEQA analysis, Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-6** shall be implemented when archaeological studies completed under Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-2** determine that a project has a less-than-significant potential for archaeological discoveries. Additionally,

upon agreement between Native American representatives (for prehistoric or historic-period Native American sites) and the City for archaeological resources that have not been determined eligible for listing in the CRHR or NRHP that are unavoidable at an Opportunity Site, Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-6** shall be implemented. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide a letter from a qualified archaeologist stating that the applicant has retained their services, and that the archaeologist shall be on call during all grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities in native sediments.

MM-CUL-7: Conduct archaeological and Native American monitoring.

If cultural resource studies have identified archaeological resources determined eligible for the CRHR or NRHP that are unavoidable at an Opportunity Site, Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-7** shall be implemented upon agreement among Native American representatives (for prehistoric or historic-period Native American sites). At least 30 days prior to application for a grading permit and before any grading, excavation, and/or ground-disturbing activities take place, the applicant shall retain an SOI Standards–qualified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown archaeological resources.

The archaeologist, in consultation with consulting tribes, the applicant, and the City, shall develop an Archaeological Monitoring Plan to address the details, timing, and responsibility of all archaeological and cultural activities that occur on a development site. Details in the plan shall include:

1. Project grading and development scheduling:
 - a. The development of a rotating or simultaneous schedule in coordination with the applicant and the project archaeologist for designated Native American tribal monitors (if resources are prehistoric in age) from the consulting tribes during grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities on the site, including the scheduling, safety requirements, duties, scope of work, and Native American tribal monitors’ authority to stop and redirect grading activities in coordination with all project archaeologists
 - b. The protocols and stipulations that the applicant, tribes, and project archaeologist for the individual development project shall follow in the event of inadvertent cultural resource discoveries, including any newly discovered cultural resource deposits that shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation
 - c. Treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains if discovered on a development site
 - d. The scheduling and timing of the Cultural Sensitivity Training

MM-CUL-8: Employ procedures for treatment and disposition of cultural resources.

If cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for individual Opportunity Sites, the following procedures shall be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:

1. **Consulting Tribe(s) Notified:** Within 24 hours of discovery, and if the resources are Native American in origin, the consulting tribe(s) shall be notified via email and phone. The applicant shall provide the City evidence of notification to consulting tribes. Consulting tribe(s) shall be allowed access to the discovery in order to assist with the significance evaluation.

2. **Temporary Curation and Storage:** During the course of construction, all discovered resources shall be temporarily curated in a secure location on site or at the offices of the project archaeologist. The removal of any artifacts from a development site shall be thoroughly inventoried with tribal monitor oversight of the process.
3. **Treatment and Final Disposition:** The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains, as part of the required mitigation for impacts on cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the City of Riverside Community & Economic Development Department with evidence of same:
 - a. Accommodate the process for onsite reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.
 - b. Execute a curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore will ensure professional curation and availability to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.
 - c. If more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the subsequent development project and cannot come to a consensus as to the disposition of cultural materials, curate the discovered items at the Western Science Center or Museum of Riverside by default.
 - d. At the completion of grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities on the site, provide to the City a Phase IV Monitoring Report documenting monitoring activities conducted by the project archaeologist and Native American tribal monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts on the known resources on the property; describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled; document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources; provide evidence of the required Cultural Sensitivity Training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grade meeting; and, in a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist. All reports produced shall be submitted to the City, the Eastern Information Center, and consulting tribes.

MM-CUL-9: Conduct cultural sensitivity training.

For Opportunity Site development projects where either Mitigation Measures **MM-CUL-6** or **MM-CUL-7** are implemented, Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-9** shall also be implemented. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the SOI Standards–certified archaeologist and Native American monitors shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the applicant/permit holder’s contractors to provide Cultural Sensitivity Training for all construction personnel. This shall include the procedures to be followed during ground disturbance in sensitive areas and protocols that apply in the event unanticipated resources are discovered. Only construction personnel who have received this training

can conduct construction and disturbance activities in sensitive areas. A sign-in sheet for attendees of this training shall be included in the Phase IV Monitoring Report.

C. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact PAL-1: The Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site.

Finding: The Project could destroy a unique paleontological resource. However, the impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-PAL-1**, **MM-PAL-2**, and **MM-PAL-3**.

Explanation:

The County of Riverside Paleontological Sensitivity Model shows that most of the area within the City limits contains geologic units with High A, High B, or Undetermined paleontological sensitivity, with a minority containing geologic units with Low paleontological sensitivity. Because the Opportunity Sites facilitated by the Project are situated throughout the City, it is likely that some of these Opportunity Sites are on geologic units with High A or Undetermined paleontological sensitivity. Project construction could disturb previously unknown significant fossils, potentially damaging or destroying these fossils. Future development facilitated by the Project could also result in the need for operations-period ground disturbance, such as landscaping or maintenance. Depending on the location and depth of ground disturbance, proposed operations could disturb previously unknown significant fossils, potentially damaging or destroying such fossils.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-PAL-1**, **MM-PAL-2**, and **MM-PAL-3** would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels by requiring the project applicant and/or private developer and the City to identify whether future development sites are in areas of high or undetermined paleontological sensitivity and could have a substantial adverse effect on the significance of unique paleontological resources. If so, a Paleontological Mitigation Plan would be developed that would provide for salvage, curation, and reporting of any paleontological resources uncovered during ground disturbance.

Reference: Section 3.4.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's paleontological resources impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures.

MM-PAL-1: Conduct paleontological resources investigations.

During the development review process and prior to construction on Opportunity Sites that are located on geologic units with Undetermined, High A, or High B paleontological sensitivity, the project applicant shall conduct paleontological resource investigations consistent with SVP guidelines. This process shall include:

- Conducting a paleontological records search through the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum to identify previously recorded paleontological localities and the presence of sensitive deposits in the City
- Reviewing Opportunity Site design and maximum depths and extents of Project ground disturbance components

- Reviewing publicly available geotechnical reports for information concerning subsurface deposits and deposit depths across the City
- Identifying the potential for sensitive paleontological deposits underlying the Opportunity Site that project implementation could affect
- Determining whether impacts on sensitive deposits, if present, would be significant.

If no sensitive deposits are identified or if they are sufficiently deeper than the Opportunity Site excavations and would not be encountered during construction, no further steps shall be required. If sensitive deposits are identified and could be affected by development of the Opportunity Sites, implement Mitigation Measure **MM-PAL-2**.

Opportunity Site projects that propose accessory dwelling units are not expected to have paleontological resource impacts and no additional assessment is necessary.

MM-PAL-2: Avoid paleontological resources or conduct monitoring.

The applicant shall redesign the Opportunity Site development to avoid sensitive paleontological resources and deposits that could potentially contain these resources. If avoidance and/or Opportunity Site redesign is infeasible, then paleontological monitoring shall be implemented and shall include the following implementation steps:

- The applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist, who shall attend the preconstruction meeting(s) to consult with the grading and excavation contractors or subcontractors concerning excavation schedules, paleontological field techniques, and safety issues. A qualified paleontologist is defined as an individual who (1) has an MS or PhD in paleontology or geology and/or a publication record in peer-reviewed journals; (2) also has demonstrated familiarity with paleontological procedures and techniques; (3) is knowledgeable in the geology and paleontology of the county; (4) has proficiency in recognizing fossils in the field, determining their significance, and collecting vertebrate fossils in the field; and (5) has worked as a paleontological mitigation project supervisor in the county for at least 1 year.
- A paleontological monitor or a qualified paleontologist shall be on site on a full-time basis during excavation and ground-disturbing activities that occur in any undisturbed deposits below ground surface, to inspect exposures for contained fossils. The paleontological monitor shall work under the direction of the Project's qualified paleontologist. A paleontological monitor is defined as an individual selected by the qualified paleontologist who has experience in the collection and salvage of fossil materials. If fossils that have significance for the scientific record are discovered on a development site, the qualified paleontologist shall recover them and temporarily direct, divert, or halt grading to allow recovery of fossil remains.
- The qualified paleontologist shall be responsible for the cleaning, repairing, sorting, and cataloguing of fossil remains collected during the monitoring and salvage portion of the mitigation program.
- Prepared fossils, along with copies of all pertinent field notes, photos, and maps, shall be deposited (as a donation) at a scientific institution with permanent paleontological collections, such as the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum.

- Within 30 days after the completion of excavation and ground-disturbing activities, the qualified paleontologist shall prepare and submit to the City of Riverside Community & Economic Development Department, Planning Division a paleontological resource recovery report that documents the results of the mitigation program. This report shall include discussions of the methods used, stratigraphic section(s) exposed, fossils collected, and significance of recovered fossils.

Opportunity Site projects that propose accessory dwelling units are not expected to have paleontological resource impacts and no additional assessment is necessary.

MM-PAL-3: Avoid/minimize impacts on paleontological resources during operations.

If significant paleontological resources and sensitive deposits with the potential to contain significant paleontological resources are identified within an Opportunity Site area during design/planning (Mitigation Measures **MM-PAL-1** and **MM-PAL-2**), and deposits that are sensitive for significant paleontological resources remain exposed at or near the ground surface or become exposed during project operations, then an avoidance and minimization plan shall be prepared to avoid/minimize potential impacts during operations. This plan may include, but not be limited to:

- Securing sensitive deposits from accessibility through the development of exclusion zones
- Preparing an operations and maintenance plan to minimize degradation and exposure of sensitive deposits
- Designing and developing interpretive exhibits to provide education and understanding of the importance of avoiding and protecting sensitive deposits and paleontological resources

If significant impacts on a newly exposed or existing significant paleontological resource cannot be avoided, then Mitigation Measure **MM-PAL-2** shall be implemented.

D. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Impact HAZ-1: The Project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Finding: The Project could create a hazard during construction by encountering hazardous materials.

Explanation:

The type and extent of the contamination will dictate the appropriate response and remediation for the site and the agencies to be notified. Although these regulatory requirements would be followed, the potential for foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of contaminated media into the environment from the construction of development allowed under the Project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Prior to the commencement of a construction project, Mitigation Measure **MM-HAZ-1** would be implemented, which would require a project-level hazardous material site assessment for construction of the specific project, which would verify the presence or absence of hazardous materials on any Opportunity Site and require subsequent measures if necessary, based on the conditions on the site.

The rezoning and GP 2025 and Specific Plan amendments are not limited only to Opportunity Sites identified for the purpose of satisfying the City's RHNA obligation and, as such, potential future residential or mixed-use development could occur in other areas of the City as part of the Project. Therefore, there is potential for ground-disturbing construction activities to encounter and release contaminated media within or adjacent to an established hazardous material site. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-HAZ-1**, impacts would reduce to less-than-significant levels.

Reference: Section 3.6.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the implementation of the following mitigation measure.

MM-HAZ-1: Conduct project-level hazardous material site assessment for construction of Opportunity Sites involving soil disturbance at sites listed on hazardous materials databases and implement measures.

For development of Opportunity Sites at or adjacent to hazardous materials sites that are listed on hazardous materials databases (see Section 3.6.2, *Environmental Setting*), prior to construction activities associated with any Opportunity Site involving ground disturbance, the specific applicant shall be required to retain a professional hazardous materials specialist specializing in hazardous material impact assessment. The professional hazardous materials specialist shall conduct a project-level analysis to verify the presence or absence of hazardous material conditions (including Cortese List sites) in the vicinity of the ground-disturbance area and if there is potential for existing hazardous material conditions to be disturbed or released as a result of construction activities.

This assessment shall consist of a search for environment-related information present in publicly accessible databases. The information shall be reviewed to determine if the construction footprint or adjacent properties are the site of (or in the vicinity of) contaminated soil or groundwater that has been left in place. If the professional hazardous materials specialist determines that the site (where ground disturbance is to occur) or hazardous material conditions in the vicinity of the site do not pose a risk, additional steps in this measure would not be required.

If the construction footprint or adjacent properties are the site of contaminated soil or groundwater, the professional hazardous materials specialist shall determine the potential risk to construction workers, the public, or the environment from construction activities. The determination of risk would consider, among other factors, regulatory status, the type of project, the type of contaminated property, distance and direction to the project, and appropriate measures. If the hazardous materials specialist concludes that the subsequent project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, then no further action would be required.

If a site is considered a risk to construction workers, the public, or the environment, the applicant shall implement measures to reduce risk including one or more of the following:

- Implementation of engineering controls and BMPs during construction to minimize human exposure to potentially contaminated soils during construction. Engineering controls and construction BMPs could include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - Contractor employees working on site handling potentially contaminated media shall be certified in the Occupational Health and Safety Administration's 40-hour Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response training.
 - Contractors shall water or mist soil as it is being excavated and stockpiled or loaded onto transport trucks.
 - Contractors shall place any stockpiled soil in areas shielded from prevailing winds or cover stockpiles with staked and/or anchored sheeting.
- Conducting a soil and/or groundwater sampling program to determine the type and extent of contaminants. The sampling program could include:
 - A scope of work for preparation of a Health and Safety Plan that specifies pre-field activity marking of boring locations and obtainment of utility clearance; and field activities, such as identifying appropriate sampling procedures, health and safety measures, chemical testing methods, and quality assurance/quality control procedures
 - Necessary permits for well installation and/or boring advancement
 - A Soil Sampling and Analysis Plan in accordance with the scope of work
 - Laboratory analyses conducted by a state-certified laboratory
 - Disposal processes, including transport by a state-certified hazardous material hauler to a state-certified disposal or recycling facility licensed to accept and treat hazardous waste
- Implementation of a Soil Management Plan. The purpose of a Soil Management Plan is to provide administrative, procedural, and analytical guidance to expedite and clarify decisions and actions if contaminated soils are encountered. Typically, procedures and protocols are included to ensure that contaminated soil is excavated properly and efficiently, and that unacceptable risks are not posed to human health or the environment from contaminated soils. Additionally, the Soil Management Plan shall contain procedures for handling, stockpiling, screening, and disposing of the excavated soil. The Soil Management Plan is a site-specific technical plan that could be required depending on other screening activities conducted (listed above) and is not included as part of this EIR.

If dewatering would be necessary in areas where contaminated groundwater exists, then dewatering procedures could be subject to permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. In addition, wastewater profiling shall be conducted to determine proper handling and disposal.

Impact HAZ-2: The Project could emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Finding: The Project could create potential impacts associated with hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials near a school.

Explanation:

There are several locations where ground-disturbing construction could occur within or immediately adjacent to a hazardous material site (types of hazardous material sites are described in detail under Section 3.6.2, *Environmental Setting*) that are within 0.25 mile of a school site. As the hazardous material site data are dynamic and can change over time, there is a potential that future, currently unlisted hazardous material sites could appear within 0.25 mile of a school and within an identified Opportunity Site. Depending on the contaminant characteristics of the hazardous material site and extent of contamination, soil-disturbance activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil. Ground-disturbing activities could release contaminated groundwater and/or soil to the environment within 0.25 mile of a school or, during remediation of a site identified as a hazardous materials site, hazardous materials could be handled within 0.25 mile of a school as the materials are removed, stockpiled, and/or transported. Consequently, affected media or hazardous materials potentially could be handled in proximity of these schools. Implementation of the proposed policies and implementing actions along with Mitigation Measure **MM-HAZ-1** would reduce potential impacts associated with hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials near a school to less-than-significant levels.

Reference: Section 3.6.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-HAZ-1** as described under Impact HAZ-1.

Impact HAZ-3: The Project would be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Finding: The Project could create potential impacts associated with construction activities occurring within or adjacent to a Cortese List site.

Explanation:

Four Cortese List sites were found in various locations throughout the City (as identified at the time of the preparation of this EIR). In addition, there are several dozen leaking underground storage tank sites (which are also considered Cortese List sites) throughout the City. Also, because the hazardous material site data are dynamic and can change over time, there is a potential that future, currently unlisted Cortese List sites could appear within an identified Opportunity Site in addition to those listed in baseline conditions. Construction activities as a result of the Project would occur at the specifically identified Opportunity Sites as well as other locations in the City that would undergo rezoning or Specific Plan amendments. As such, it is possible that construction could occur within or immediately adjacent to a site fitting the Cortese List site criteria as a result of the Project. Depending on the contaminant characteristics and extent of contamination, soil disturbance activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil and potentially result in impacts on construction personnel and the surrounding environment due to the potential release of hazardous materials and exacerbation of existing conditions. Implementation of the proposed policies and implementing actions along with Mitigation Measure **MM-HAZ-1** would reduce potential impacts associated with construction activities occurring within or adjacent to a Cortese List site to less-than-significant levels.

Reference: Section 3.6.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-HAZ-1** as described under Impact HAZ-1.

E. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact TCR-1: The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that has cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is 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).

Finding: The Project could encounter a tribal cultural resource (TCR) that is listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR or in a local register during construction.

Explanation:

Most of the Opportunity Sites identified for this Project are in areas of unknown archaeological sensitivity, while a smaller number of these sites are in areas of low to high archaeological sensitivity. Because the Opportunity Sites under the proposed Housing Element Update are situated throughout the City in mostly urban and developed areas and in mostly unsurveyed areas, the potential for Opportunity Sites to encounter archaeological resources is unknown. Some prehistoric resources may be considered TCRs and can include sites, features, and objects that are listed in the CRHR, eligible to be listed in the CRHR, or locally listed as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k). Future cultural resource studies at Opportunity Site locations (see Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-2**) could identify both archaeological resources and/or TCRs through survey and consultation with Native American tribes.

The Pechanga and Soboba Tribes have indicated that the area is culturally sensitive and identified types of resources that exist in the City that could be considered TCRs, although the specific locations of such resources were not provided. Therefore, it is unknown whether such resources are listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k). It is likely, however, that resources such as those described by Pechanga (e.g., rock art, pictographs, petroglyphs) would be considered eligible TCRs and are likely to be identified as such. Additionally, the Native American Heritage Commission has identified the City as being positive for Sacred Lands, although the locations are unspecified. Through continued consultation with tribes on a project-specific basis and implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-2**, it is possible that the City will be able to determine whether specific Opportunity Sites overlap with known locations of TCRs.

Development of Opportunity Sites would potentially include the excavation of soils in undeveloped (vacant) areas and demolition of existing structures in developed areas. Excavation and demolition activities, particularly those that involve disturbance of previously unexcavated native soil, could result in the discovery of previously unidentified resources that might be considered TCRs. At least one tribe has described the presence of resources that could be considered TCRs in the City. Therefore, ground-disturbing activities could result in disturbance or destruction of TCRs, which would be a potentially significant impact. For Opportunity Site projects that are not eligible for the ministerial approval process (and not projects per CEQA), and with continued consultation with Native American tribes, implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-CUL-2** through **MM-CUL-9**, **MM-TCR-1**, and **MM-TCR-2** would reduce this impact to less-than-significant levels.

Reference: Section 3.13.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the project's TCR impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-CUL-2** through **MM-CUL-9** (described above) would reduce potential impacts on TCRs to less-than-significant levels, in addition to MM-TCR-1 and MM-TCR-2 provided below.

MM-TCR-1: Implement tribal cultural resources protocols and measures determined through consultation.

During project-level CEQA review, when required, of Opportunity Site projects that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR, the City can and should develop project-level protocols and mitigation measures with consulting tribes, consistent with PRC Section 21080.3.2(a), to avoid or reduce impacts on TCRs during construction and operation of future development projects. Individual project proponents shall fund the effort to identify these resources through records searches, survey, consultation, or other means, to develop minimization and avoidance methods where possible and to consult with Native American tribes participating in AB 52 consultation to develop mitigation measures for TCRs that may experience substantial adverse changes.

In the absence of any specific mitigation measures developed during AB 52 consultation, the City shall develop standard mitigation measures set forth in PRC Section 21084.3(b).

The following are standard mitigation measures for TCRs.

1. Avoid and preserve the resources in place including, but not limited to, planning and constructing to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context, or planning greenspace, parks, or other open space to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
2. Treat the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to:
 - a. Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource
 - b. Protecting the traditional use of the resource
 - c. Protecting the confidentiality of the resource
 - d. Creating permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or using the resources or places
 - e. Protecting the resource

MM-TCR-2: Conduct consultation with City and applicant.

Prior to grading permit issuance, if there are any changes to project site design and/or proposed grades, the applicant or project sponsor and the City shall contact consulting tribes to provide an electronic copy of the revised plans for review. Additional consultation shall occur among the City, applicant, and

consulting tribes to discuss any proposed changes and review any new impacts and/or potential avoidance/preservation of the cultural resources on the individual development sites. The City and the applicant shall make all attempts to avoid and/or preserve in place as many cultural and paleontological resources as possible on the individual development site if the site design and/or proposed grades should be revised. In the event of inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources, work shall temporarily halt until agreements are executed with consulting tribes to provide tribal monitoring for ground-disturbing activities.

Impact TCR-2: The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that has cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is a resource determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1.

Finding: The Project could encounter a TCR that is determined a resource by the lead agency during construction.

Explanation:

Any ground-disturbing activities associated with proposed development of Opportunity Sites that have not had a cultural resources study at them within the past 5 years could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR that has cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is a resource determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1. For Opportunity Site projects that are not eligible for the ministerial approval process (and are projects per CEQA), and through continued consultation with Native American tribes, implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-CUL-2** through **MM-CUL-9**, **MM-TCR-1**, and **MM-TCR-2** would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels. These mitigation measures would ensure that the project applicant is aware of the potential of TCRs on individual Opportunity Sites; additionally, these mitigation measures provide procedures for implementing proper cultural resource studies, consultation, unanticipated discovery procedures, preservation in place (if possible), and methods for identification, evaluation, and treatment of resources (including TCRs) if necessary such that potential impacts on TCRs are reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Reference: Section 3.13.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's TCR impacts.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-CUL-2** through **MM-CUL-9** (described under Impact CUL-2), **MM-TCR-1**, and **MM-TCR-2** (described under Impact TCR-1) would reduce potential impacts on TCRs to less-than-significant levels.

IV. FINDINGS FOR IMPACTS THAT ARE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

The City Council hereby finds that the mitigation measures discussed below, which are identified in the EIR and will lessen the following significant environmental impacts but not to a less-than-significant level, have been required in or incorporated into the Project. ***The findings below are for impacts where implementation of the Project may result in significant, unavoidable environmental impacts. These findings are based on the discussion of impacts in the detailed impact analyses in Section 3.1 through Section 3.16 of the EIR, as well as relevant responses to comments in the Final EIR.***

The following impacts from the Project and related approvals cannot be fully mitigated to a less-than-significant level and a Statement of Overriding Considerations is therefore included herein:

A. AIR QUALITY

Impact AQ-1: The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Finding: The Project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that attempt to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, as identified in the EIR and elsewhere in the record, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3)).

Explanation:

The 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) relies on emissions forecasts based on the demographic and economic growth projections provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2016 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). In turn, SCAG's population, housing, and employment forecasts are based on data from local general plans, which in this case would be the existing GP 2025. However, under the Project, general plan amendments, Zoning Code changes, and Specific Plan amendments are proposed to fulfill the City's 6th cycle RHNA requirements. Given that none of these changes to the existing GP 2025 resulting in additional growth were considered in SCAG's growth assumptions in the 2016 RTP/SCS, the emissions inventory in the 2016 AQMP would not have accounted for this additional growth.

Future development under the Project would exceed SCAG's projections in the 2016 RTP/SCS upon which the regional emissions inventory for the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) in the AQMP was based. As such, the Project would not be consistent with the 2016 AQMP under this criterion. It should be noted that in future updates to the AQMP, the updated growth projections resulting from the Project would eventually be incorporated by SCAG and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) into their regional planning projections and they would become consistent with the AQMP. However, the growth projects (i.e., Opportunity Sites) facilitated by the Project would not be consistent with the current 2016 AQMP. While implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-AQ-1** and **MM-AQ-2** for future development projects would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions, they would not be able to reduce the emissions associated with build-out of the Project to below SCAQMD's significance thresholds. Additionally, although the general plan amendments, Zoning Code changes, and Specific Plan amendments under the Project would need to be implemented in order to fulfill the City's 6th cycle RHNA requirements, the additional growth facilitated by the Project would remain inconsistent with the current 2016 AQMP.

The City will coordinate with SCAQMD and SCAG to update the AQMP and State Implementation Plan (SIP) with the new growth projections due to the implementation of the Project. However, because updates to the regional growth projections and the AQMP would be completed by external agencies (SCAG and SCAQMD) and completed on a fixed schedule, the revisions may not be completed before construction of new development facilitated by the Project (i.e., before any conflict or impact occurs). Until the AQMP and SIP are revised, the Project would result in a significant impact with respect to consistency with the AQMP and SIP. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Section 3.1.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's air quality impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures will be implemented to reduce the impacts to the extent feasible:

MM-AQ-1: Implement measures to reduce construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions.

Prior to approval by the City for non-ministerial projects proposed on Opportunity Sites, applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts to the Planning Division for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with SCAQMD methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the City shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans or construction drawings) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City's Building and Safety Division. While specific mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce construction-related emissions would be determined during project-level analysis, potential mitigation could include, but is not limited to:

- Requiring fugitive-dust control measures that exceed SCAQMD's Rule 403, such as:
 - Use of nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion
 - Applying water every 3 hours to active soil-disturbing activities
 - Tarping and/or maintaining a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials
- Using construction equipment rated by EPA as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower
- Ensuring that construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards
- Limiting nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than 5 consecutive minutes
- Limiting onsite vehicle travel speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour
- Installing wheel washers for all exiting trucks or washing all trucks and equipment leaving the project area
- Using Super-Compliant VOC paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible¹

MM-AQ-2: Implement measures to reduce criteria air pollutant emissions during operation.

Prior to approval by the City for non-ministerial development projects proposed on Opportunity Sites, applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts to the Planning Division for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with SCAQMD methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operations-

¹ A list of Super-Compliant architectural coating manufactures can be found on SCAQMD's website at <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/architectural-coatings/super-compliant-manf-list.pdf?sfvrsn=77>.

related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the Planning Division shall require incorporation of mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities, to be included as part of the conditions of approval. Possible mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce long-term emissions could include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Providing truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with CARB Rule 2845 (13 California Code of Regulations Chapter 10 § 2485)
- Providing changing/shower facilities as specified in Section A5.106.4.3 of the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures)
- Providing bicycle parking facilities per Section A4.106.9 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of CALGreen
- Providing preferential parking spaces for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles per Section A5.106.5.1 of CALGreen (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures)
- Encouraging facilities to support electric charging stations per Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) and Section A5.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of CALGreen
- Providing appliances shall be Energy Star–certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency (e.g., dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers). Installation of Energy Star–certified or equivalent appliances shall be verified by Building & Safety during plan check
- Equipping landscaped common areas with electrical outlets to enable use of electric landscaping equipment to the extent feasible

Impact AQ-2: The Project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as nonattainment under an applicable federal or state air quality standard.

Finding: The Project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the Project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that attempt to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, as identified in the EIR and elsewhere in the record, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3)).

Explanation:

Implementation of the Project would result in increases of certain criteria air pollutant emissions as compared to existing conditions. These increases would exceed SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and carbon monoxide (CO). Conversely, the Project would result in a decrease in particulate matter 10 microns or smaller in diameter (PM₁₀) and particulate matter 2.5 microns or smaller in diameter (PM_{2.5}) emissions as compared to existing conditions if the Opportunity Sites are developed

to full build-out. This is due to the adoption of SCAQMD Rule 445 in 2008, which prohibits the installation of wood-burning fireplaces and stoves in new development.

The exceedances of ROG, NO_x, and CO emissions with Project operation are largely due to area sources, which result from architectural coatings (i.e., periodic painting), use of consumer products (i.e., household cleaning products, aerosols), and landscaping associated with both residential and nonresidential uses. Mitigation Measure **MM-AQ-2** contains several strategies for reducing emissions from operational sources, including installation of electrical outlets in residential common areas and use of electrical landscaping equipment. These measures have not been quantified, and it cannot be stated with certainty that emissions would be reduced below significance thresholds with implementation of this mitigation. For this reason, operational emissions would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Project's operational emissions would exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds for ROG, NO_x, and CO. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-AQ-1** and **MM-AQ-2** would help ensure that the individual developments within the City would not contribute a significant level of air pollution such that regional air quality within the Basin would be degraded. However, because cumulative development within the City would exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds, the Project could contribute to an increase in health effects in the Basin until the attainment standards are met. Accordingly, health impacts related to regional criteria pollutants would be significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Section 3.1.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's air quality impacts.

Mitigation Measures

Full text of Mitigation Measures **AQ-1** and **AQ-2** are contained under section IV(A)(1) above.

Impact AQ-3: The Project could result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Finding: The Project could result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The impact would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that attempt to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, as identified in the EIR and elsewhere in the record, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3)).

Explanation:

Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) were developed in response to the SCAQMD Governing Board's Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative. Because an LST analysis can only be conducted at a project level, quantification of LSTs is not applicable for the program-level environmental analysis of the Project. Potential development and redevelopment could occur close to existing sensitive receptors, future development projects that would be accommodated by the Project have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Larger development projects or projects that exceed the LST thresholds within the City would be required to conduct air dispersion modeling, consistent with SCAQMD's LST guidance document, and mitigate impacts accordingly. However, construction equipment exhaust combined with fugitive particulate matter emissions has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of criteria air pollutant emissions, as well as diesel particulate matter (DPM), and could result in a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure **MM-AQ-1** would reduce the regional construction emissions associated with build-out of the Project and therefore also result in a reduction of localized construction-related criteria air pollutant and DPM emissions to the extent feasible. However, because existing sensitive receptors may be close to project-related construction activities, construction generated by individual development projects have the potential to exceed SCAQMD's LSTs and a significant and unavoidable impact would occur.

According to SCAQMD LST methodology, LSTs would apply to the operational phase of a proposed development project if the development includes stationary sources or attracts mobile sources that may spend extended periods queuing and idling at the site (e.g., warehouse or transfer facilities). Mitigation Measure **MM-AQ-2**, which would help reduce operational criteria air emissions from individual projects to the extent feasible. However, because existing sensitive receptors may be close to new emissions sources, operational emissions generated by individual development projects have the potential to exceed SCAQMD's LSTs and a significant and unavoidable impact would occur.

Construction and operation of future development allowed under the Project would increase activities that may expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Mitigation Measure **MM-AQ-3** would ensure mobile sources of toxic air contaminants not covered under SCAQMD permits are considered during subsequent project-level environmental review by the City. However, implementation of the Project would result in land uses that could generate toxic air contaminants from both permitted and non-permitted sources (e.g., trucks) that could contribute to elevated levels in the Basin. All construction would be required to comply with SCAQMD rules regulating construction activities, and implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-AQ-1** would serve to substantially reduce DPM emission from construction activities. While individual projects that are subject to the CEQA process or to SCAQMD permitting requirements would be required to comply with SCAQMD rules and regulations, the Project may introduce uses that could increase toxic air contaminant emissions that would contribute to the higher levels of risk in the Basin. Therefore, the Project's contribution to health risk is significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Section 3.1.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's air quality impacts.

Mitigation Measures

Full text of Mitigation Measures **AQ-1** and **AQ-2** are contained under section IV(A)(1) above.

Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-3: Prepare a health risk assessment.

Prior to approval by the City, applicants for Opportunity Site development that (1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered transport refrigeration units, and (2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residences, schools, hospitals, or nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit an HRA to the Planning Division for review and approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and SCAQMD. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk and/or noncancer hazard index exceeds the respective thresholds, as established by SCAQMD at the time a project is considered, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms, that are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks are implemented. Best available control technologies for toxics may include, but are not limited to, restricting idling on site or electrifying warehousing docks to reduce DPM or requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. Best available

control technologies for toxics identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the project plans.

B. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Impact GHG-1: The Project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Finding: The Project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that attempt to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, as identified in the EIR and elsewhere in the record, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3)).

Explanation:

Construction of the Project would result in direct GHG emissions generated by vehicle trips (i.e., trips by construction workers and haul trucks) and operation of construction equipment. Indirect GHG emissions would be generated by the electricity used to power any electric construction equipment, mobile offices, or water delivered to construction sites. Construction of a multitude of individual development projects that could occur within the City throughout the build-out period could generate GHG emissions that could have a significant impact on the environment. The Project would implement Mitigation Measure **MM-GHG-1** to reduce emissions resulting from future construction-related activities due to the development of the new residential and nonresidential land uses allowable under the Project.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-GHG-1** would help reduce GHG emissions from construction-related activities to the extent feasible. However, construction time frames and equipment for site-specific development projects are not available at this time, and there is potential for implementation of the Project to result in significant construction-related GHG emissions. Therefore, despite adherence to Mitigation Measure **MM-GHG-1**, this impact as it pertains to the Project would remain significant and unavoidable.

Operation of the Project would result in emissions from changes in travel patterns and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the transportation network, as well as from onsite combustion of natural gas for space and water heating, water consumption, waste generation, landscaping equipment, and use of electricity. Most emissions during operations would result from mobile sources. The Project's objectives as well as the locations of Opportunity Sites prioritize infill and mixed-use development and encourage the use of public transit to limit vehicle trips within the City.

The strategies provided in Mitigation Measure **MM-TRA-1** would reduce VMT and transportation-related GHG emissions through promoting the use of non-motorized transportation, including providing bicycling parking; providing car-sharing, bike sharing, and ride-sharing programs; providing transit passes; and increasing connectivity and/or intersection density in conjunction with development of Opportunity Sites, among others.

Energy use during operation of the Project would be the second largest source of GHG emissions, mostly from the use of natural gas (primarily for space and water heating). In order to reduce emissions, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure **MM-GHG-2** to ensure that new construction would not include any onsite fuel combustion, and all new buildings would be installed with electrical lighting and heating to the extent feasible.

Mitigation Measure **MM-GHG-3** requires implementation of all feasible CALGreen Tier 1 and Tier 2 voluntary measures. While implementation of the feasible CALGreen voluntary measures would ensure a reduction in GHG emissions during operation of the Project, it cannot be guaranteed that the measures would reduce them to a level that aligns with statewide GHG goals. The impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Section 3.5.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's GHG impacts.

Mitigation Measures

MM-GHG-1: Implement diesel emission-reduction measures during construction.

The applicant and/or contractor associated with future development of Opportunity Sites shall implement the following measures during construction and, where specified below, shall submit reports demonstrating compliance to the Planning Division for its review and approval.

The applicant shall limit all equipment and delivery truck idling times by shutting down equipment when not in use and reducing the maximum idling time to less than 3 minutes. The applicant shall also install clear signage regarding the limitation on idling time at the delivery driveway and loading areas.

The applicant shall verify that all construction equipment is maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. Prior to the commencement of construction activities using diesel-powered vehicles or equipment, the applicant shall verify that all vehicles and equipment have been checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to admittance into the delivery driveway and loading areas. The applicant shall submit a report by the certified mechanic of the condition construction-related vehicles and equipment to the Planning Division prior to commencement of their use.

MM-GHG-2: Restrict use of natural gas in new development.

Future development on Opportunity Sites shall utilize electrical lighting and heating to the maximum extent feasible or to the extent required by existing or future regulations. Natural gas appliances are to be avoided to the extent feasible as determined by the availability and capacity of electrical power distribution infrastructure.

MM-GHG-3: Implement measures to reduce GHG emissions during operation.

Prior to discretionary approval by the City for Opportunity Site projects subject to CEQA review (i.e., non-ministerial projects), each applicant shall be required to demonstrate that all feasible Tier 1 and Tier 2 CALGreen voluntary measures (Appendix A4 and Appendix A5 of the 2019 CALGreen²) shall be implemented.

MM-TRA-1: Implement VMT mitigation options.

As individual Opportunity Sites are developed, future development projects shall implement all feasible mitigation measures to reduce VMT.

² CalGreen is a shortened form of the California Green Building Standards Code.

The amount and type of mitigation needed will vary based on the type and location of projects, as development in some areas of the City will generate VMT that is 15 percent below the existing VMT, some will generate VMT that is 0–15 percent below the City average, and others are in areas with VMT higher than the City average. Figure 3.12-1 shows the VMT per service population for each transportation analysis zone in the City and summarizes these three different efficiency areas of the City.

Opportunity Site development projects in very efficient areas (e.g., more than 15 percent below the City average) shown in blue on the figure can be presumed not to have a significant VMT impact and would not need any VMT mitigation due to their location efficiency.

Opportunity Site development projects in moderately efficient areas (e.g., between 0 percent and 15 percent below the City average) proposed pursuant to the Project shown in yellow on the figure shall incorporate a moderate amount of VMT mitigation. Potential measures for each individual development include, but are not limited to:

- Consider incorporating affordable housing into the Opportunity Site project (expected range of effectiveness 0.04–1.20 percent VMT reduction).³
- Connect the Opportunity Site project to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities (expected range of effectiveness 0.25–0.5 percent VMT reduction).²
- Provide bicycle parking (expected range of effectiveness 0.05–0.14 percent VMT reduction).²
- Consider unbundling parking costs (expected range of effectiveness 2.6–13.0 percent VMT reduction).²
- Provide car-sharing, bike sharing, or ride-sharing programs (expected range of effectiveness 0.4–15.0 percent VMT reduction).²
- Provide transit passes (expected range of effectiveness 0.3–20.0 percent VMT reduction).²
- Increase Opportunity Site project density up to maximum zoning density to the extent feasible (expected range of effectiveness 0.8–30.0 percent VMT reduction).²
- For Opportunity Site projects that are 2 acres or larger, provide publicly accessible shared-mobility zones.⁴

Opportunity Site development projects in the least-efficient areas (e.g., higher VMT per service population than the City average) shown in red on the figure shall be subject to the maximum amount of TDM considered feasible in the City. These measures⁵ include, but are not limited to:

- Identify measures for moderately efficient areas.

³ Expected range of effectiveness in VMT reduction from *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures* (CAPCOA 2010). Expected range of effectiveness will vary based on specific project implementation. Measures' effectiveness will dampen as multiple measures are applied together.

⁴ The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association does not provide an estimated range of effectiveness for shared-mobility zones.

⁵ TDM measures are consistent with those identified in the Western Riverside Council of Governments Implementation Pathway Study as documented in the TDM Strategy Assessment (Fehr & Peers 2019).

- Improve or increase access to transit (expected range of effectiveness 0.5–24.6 percent VMT reduction).²
- Increase access to common goods and services, such as groceries, schools, and daycare (expected range of effectiveness 6.7–20.0 percent VMT reduction).²
- Improve pedestrian or bicycle networks or transit service (expected range of effectiveness 0.02–8.2 percent VMT reduction).²
- For Opportunity Site projects that are 3 acres or larger, provide traffic calming on site in accordance with the Complete Streets Ordinance (expected range of effectiveness 0.25–1.0 percent VMT reduction).²
- Increase connectivity and/or intersection density on the Opportunity Site projects that are 3 or more acres (expected range of effectiveness 3.0–21.3 percent VMT reduction).²

Impact GHG-2: The Project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Finding: The Project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that attempt to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, as identified in the EIR and elsewhere in the record, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3)).

Explanation:

Construction and operation of the Project would have the potential to conflict with relevant plans, policies, and regulatory programs with purposes of reducing GHG emissions. The Project includes the adoption and implementation of the Housing Element Update for the 2021–2029 planning period, adoption and implementation of Environmental Justice Policies, and updates to the Zoning Code and Specific Plans to address requirements of the 6th RHNA cycle. The Project would address energy efficiency and renewable energy procurement objectives necessary to reduce GHG emissions from energy use. However, mitigation is required to ensure the Project considers all feasible GHG reduction strategies related to energy use. Mitigation Measure **MM-GHG-2** promotes all-electric buildings that do not include any onsite fuel combustion by restricting the use of natural gas in new development to the extent feasible. Additionally, Mitigation Measure **MM-GHG-3** requires implementation of all feasible CALGreen Tier 1 and Tier 2 voluntary measures, which could include measures to promote insulation and energy efficiency.

Policies specifically propose expansion of bicycle infrastructure, including bicycle lanes and bicycle trails; provision of options for bicycle parking; accelerated implementation of the City’s Bicycle Master Plan; creation of nodes offering bike sharing throughout the City; and provision of pedestrian-only community areas. The strategies provided in Mitigation Measure **MM-TRA-1** that would reduce VMT and transportation-related GHG emissions through non-motorized transportation include providing bicycling parking; providing car-sharing, bike sharing, and ride-sharing programs; providing transit passes; and increasing connectivity and/or intersection density on future development sites, among others.

Implementation of the Project is anticipated to generate VMT per service population that exceeds the long-term regional VMT target. Therefore, because VMT would exceed the regional target, the Project would not fully support the California Air Resources Board's VMT-reduction planning and GHG-reduction goals and would conflict with the state's long-term emission-reduction trajectory.

Opportunity Site development would achieve efficient water use largely due to mandatory compliance with statewide programs and regulations. Mitigation Measure **MM-GHG-3** requires implementation of all feasible CALGreen Tier 1 and Tier 2 voluntary measures, which could include water efficiency measures, such as use of greywater and rainwater for landscape irrigation.

The potential impacts of the Project described in this section would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-GHG-1** through **MM-GHG-3**. However, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Section 3.5.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's GHG impacts.

Mitigation Measures

Full text of Mitigation Measures **GHG-1**, **GHG-2**, **GHG-3**, and **TRA-1** are contained under section IV(B) above.

C. NOISE

Impact NOI-1: The Project would generate temporary or permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards for the City.

Finding: The Project would generate temporary or permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards for the City. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that attempt to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, as identified in the EIR and elsewhere in the record, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3)).

Explanation:

Changes in traffic noise under existing conditions plus the Project would range from 0 decibel (dB) (no increase over the existing conditions) to 1.3 dB (increase over the existing conditions). The cumulative plus Project conditions show a similar change, ranging from a 0-dB increase up to 0.5 dB over the cumulative base condition. Noise levels calculated in Table 3.8-14 are considered conservative, as they do not account for any shielding from intervening structures or walls, which would further reduce traffic noise levels. As shown, many of the roadway segments analyzed currently exceed the 60 A-weighted decibel (dBA) and 65 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) thresholds for the single-family residential and infill single-family residential referenced in the City's Land Use Compatibility Matrix for Noise Exposure. The largest increase would be on the order of 1.3 dB over existing and 0.5 dB over the cumulative base. While noise levels of this magnitude would not likely be discernable, many of the Opportunity Sites within the City currently exceed the relevant thresholds outlined by GP 2025. As a result, mitigation (in the form of Mitigation Measure **MM-NOI-1**) would be necessary in order to reduce the impacts to the greatest extent practical. However, even with the inclusion of Mitigation Measure **MM-NOI-1**, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

New residential and mixed-use development would likely result in the installation of heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. At a distance of 50 feet (assuming a 6-dB reduction for doubling of distance), HVAC system noise would reduce to 44 dBA. As the location of HVAC systems is not known, it is possible that HVAC systems may exceed both the daytime and/or nighttime sound level limits included in the City's Municipal Code. Mitigation (in the form of Mitigation Measure **MM-NOI-2**) would be required to reduce impacts to the greatest extent practical. However, even with the inclusion of Mitigation Measure **MM-NOI-2**, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

As discussed above, the adoption of the Project could potentially result in impacts from traffic noise and stationary noise sources associated with new development within the City. The proposed Environmental Justice Policy N-EJ-1.0 provides a directive to "focus on environmental justice communities, reduce noise pollution by enforcing noise reduction and control measures within and adjacent to residential neighborhoods." Inclusion of Mitigation Measures **MM-NOI-1** and **MM-NOI-2** would help to reduce noise pollution.

In summary, with the inclusion of mitigation measures listed below, impacts from construction would be less than significant; however, impacts from operations would be significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated.

Reference: Section 3.8.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's noise impacts.

Mitigation Measures

MM-NOI-1: Prepare a focused noise study and implement findings to reduce traffic noise.

For Opportunity Site projects that would exceed the 60 or 65 dBA CNEL threshold (based on the noise contour maps included in GP 2025), the applicant shall prepare a detailed analysis and implement mitigation to comply with the applicable City standards outlined in GP 2025. This could include but would not be limited to actions such as:

- Installation of soundwalls to break the line of sight from noise sources such as traffic noise
- Installation of noise-reducing insulation
- Installation of windows with sound transmission class (STC) ratings appropriate to reduce exterior-to-interior noise transmission
- Installation of HVAC systems

MM-NOI-2: For any development where stationary noise sources may exceed interior or exterior noise standards, prepare a focused noise study and implement findings to reduce HVAC noise.

The applicant shall design HVAC systems for Opportunity Sites to comply with the applicable City Municipal Code standards. This could include but would not be limited to actions such as:

- Preparation of a focused noise study to analyze HVAC noise, which shall identify a location for HVAC systems at appropriate distances so as to not exceed a noise level of 55 dBA L_{eq} (exterior) and 45 dBA L_{eq} (interior) between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA L_{eq} (exterior) and 35 dBA L_{eq} (interior) between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. at the closest noise-sensitive land use. Design features that could be used to comply with the relevant threshold could include but are not limited to:

- Locating HVAC systems far enough from residences so as to allow noise to attenuate to below the relevant standards
- Installing housings or structural parapets around HVAC systems
- Installing noise-reducing insulation
- Installing windows with STC ratings appropriate to reduce exterior-to-interior noise transmission

Impact NOI-2: The Project could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Finding: The Project could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that attempt to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, as identified in the EIR and elsewhere in the record, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3)).

Explanation:

The threshold for extremely fragile historic buildings is 0.12 peak particle velocity (PPV) for transient vibration sources and 0.08 PPV for frequent intermittent sources for damage. The thresholds for annoyance criteria show that vibration would be barely perceptible at levels of 0.01 PPV for frequent intermittent sources and 0.04 PPV for transient vibration sources. Vibration levels could potentially exceed the damage threshold of 0.08 PPV if construction occurred within 25 feet of extremely fragile buildings and would be barely perceptible at a distance of approximately 200 feet. As the location of construction is not known at this time, construction vibration levels cannot be calculated at specific vibration-sensitive land uses. Therefore, impacts from vibration could be significant. Even with the inclusion of Mitigation Measure **MM-NOI-3**, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Section 3.8.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's noise impacts.

Mitigation Measures

MM-NOI-3: Reduce construction-generated groundborne vibration to the extent possible.

The City of Riverside Community & Economic Development Department, Planning Division shall, to the extent possible, require that heavy construction equipment (representative equipment such as large bulldozers) is not operated within 25 feet of onsite or offsite sensitive receptors (including, but not limited to, single- and multi-family residences, institutional or care facilities, etc.). If construction is anticipated within 25 feet of onsite or offsite sensitive receptors, the City shall require pre- and post-construction surveys to confirm that vibration did not result in damage to surrounding structures. Additionally, the City shall require vibration monitoring at the structure to determine if vibration levels exceed the 0.08 PPV threshold at the structure. Should an exceedance be identified, construction would be halted and additional measures would be implemented in order to reduce vibration levels. These additional measures could include, but are not limited to:

- Using smaller or less vibration-intensive equipment

- Maximizing the distance from the vibration source

D. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Impact POP-1: The Project would result in substantial unplanned population growth either directly or indirectly.

Finding: The Project would result in substantial unplanned population growth either directly or indirectly. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that attempt to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, as identified in the EIR and elsewhere in the record, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3)).

Explanation:

According to SCAG, the population of the City is projected to increase to 395,800 by 2045, which represents an increase of 20.61 percent from the 2020 population of 328,155. Based on DOF population and housing estimates, the City's current average household size is 3.28 persons. The increase in population that would potentially result by adding 31,564 new housing units would result in a population increase of 103,530 persons, which would be greater than the SCAG 2045 population projection of 67,645 new residents. Implementation of the Housing Element Update would result in additional housing beyond what is currently allowed under the existing GP 2025 and SCAG projections. This could result in an additional net increase of 47,175 in City population beyond what is currently anticipated at build-out under GP 2025 (increase of 56,355 persons). As the Project would result in projections beyond what was anticipated in the GP 2025 and no mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Section 3.9.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's population and housing impacts.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are available for this impact.

E. TRANSPORTATION

Impact TRA-2: The Project would conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), as the Project would affect the VMT in the City of Riverside.

Finding: The Project would conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), as the Project would affect the VMT in the City. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that attempt to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, as identified in the EIR and elsewhere in the record, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15091(a)(3)).

Explanation:

The Project's effect on VMT is considered a significant impact for the total link-level boundary VMT, and a less-than-significant impact for the link-level boundary VMT per service population. The results show that the total link-level VMT within the City boundary would increase with the addition of the Project in the base and future years. Because the Project would increase population and employment within the City, VMT would increase. However, as shown in Table 3.12-5 (City of Riverside Project Effect on VMT Summary), the VMT per service population would decrease within the City, showing that travel on a per-person basis would be more efficient with the addition of the Project.

Mitigation Measure **MM-TRA-1** would be required to reduce impacts, as the Project would affect the VMT in the City. Given the uncertainty in some components of the measures that influence VMT (such as the cost of fuel) combined with the City's inability to influence other measures that would have the largest effect on VMT (such as implementation of a VMT tax or an increase in the fuel tax), the effectiveness of these Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures cannot be guaranteed to reduce impacts and the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Section 3.12.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's transportation impacts.

Mitigation Measures

MM-TRA-1: Implement VMT mitigation options.

As individual Opportunity Sites are developed, future development projects shall implement all feasible mitigation measures to reduce VMT.

The amount and type of mitigation needed will vary based on the type and location of projects, as development in some areas of the City will generate VMT that is 15 percent below the existing VMT, some will generate VMT that is 0–15 percent below the City average, and others are in areas with VMT higher than the City average. Figure 3.12-1 shows the VMT per service population for each transportation analysis zone in the City and summarizes these three different efficiency areas of the City.

Opportunity Site development projects in very efficient areas (e.g., more than 15 percent below the City average) shown in blue on the figure can be presumed not to have a significant VMT impact and would not need any VMT mitigation due to their location efficiency.

Opportunity Site development projects in moderately efficient areas (e.g., between 0 percent and 15 percent below the City average) proposed pursuant to the Project shown in yellow on the figure shall incorporate a moderate amount of VMT mitigation. Potential measures for each individual development include, but are not limited to:

- Consider incorporating affordable housing into the Opportunity Site project (expected range of effectiveness 0.04–1.20 percent VMT reduction).⁶

⁶ Expected range of effectiveness in VMT reduction from *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures* (CAPCOA 2010). Expected range of effectiveness will vary based on specific project implementation. Measures' effectiveness will dampen as multiple measures are applied together.

- Connect the Opportunity Site project to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities (expected range of effectiveness 0.25–0.5 percent VMT reduction).²
- Provide bicycle parking (expected range of effectiveness 0.05–0.14 percent VMT reduction).²
- Consider unbundling parking costs (expected range of effectiveness 2.6–13.0 percent VMT reduction).²
- Provide car-sharing, bike sharing, or ride-sharing programs (expected range of effectiveness 0.4–15.0 percent VMT reduction).²
- Provide transit passes (expected range of effectiveness 0.3–20.0 percent VMT reduction).²
- Increase Opportunity Site project density up to maximum zoning density to the extent feasible (expected range of effectiveness 0.8–30.0 percent VMT reduction).²
- For Opportunity Site projects that are 2 acres or larger, provide publicly accessible shared-mobility zones.⁷

Opportunity Site development projects in the least-efficient areas (e.g., higher VMT per service population than the City average) shown in red on the figure shall be subject to the maximum amount of TDM considered feasible in the City. These measures⁸ include, but are not limited to:

- Identify measures for moderately efficient areas.
- Improve or increase access to transit (expected range of effectiveness 0.5–24.6 percent VMT reduction).²
- Increase access to common goods and services, such as groceries, schools, and daycare (expected range of effectiveness 6.7–20.0 percent VMT reduction).²
- Improve pedestrian or bicycle networks or transit service (expected range of effectiveness 0.02–8.2 percent VMT reduction).²
- For Opportunity Site projects that are 3 acres or larger, provide traffic calming on site in accordance with the Complete Streets Ordinance (expected range of effectiveness 0.25–1.0 percent VMT reduction).²
- Increase connectivity and/or intersection density on the Opportunity Site projects that are 3 or more acres (expected range of effectiveness 3.0–21.3 percent VMT reduction).²

V. FINDINGS REGARDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Consistent with CEQA’s requirements, the EIR includes an analysis of cumulative impacts, which include the impacts of the Project plus all other pending or approved projects within the affected area for each resource. Where evaluation of potential cumulative impacts are located (e.g., noise, traffic, visual quality, biological, cultural resources, and public utilities) the analysis is based on a list of past, present, and probable future

⁷ The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association does not provide an estimated range of effectiveness for shared-mobility zones.

⁸ TDM measures are consistent with those identified in the Western Riverside Council of Governments Implementation Pathway Study as documented in the TDM Strategy Assessment (Fehr & Peers 2019).

projects producing related or cumulative impacts (see Draft EIR Section 3.16). The cumulative impact analysis utilizes the summary-of-projections method as allowed under CEQA and reviews build-out of the general plans and Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs) of the County of Riverside, as well as the adjacent cities of Norco, Jurupa Valley, Moreno Valley, Colton, Corona, and Grand Terrace, an area encompassing part of the Inland Empire. For population and housing, the analysis considers the SCAG's 2020–2045 RTP/SCS for build-out of the six-county SCAG region.

A. AIR QUALITY

Potential cumulative air quality impacts would result when other projects' pollutant emissions combine to degrade air quality conditions below acceptable levels. This could occur on a local level (e.g., increased vehicle emissions at congested intersections or concurrent construction activities at sensitive receptor locations) or a regional level (e.g., potential ozone [O₃] impacts from multiple past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within the Basin). Given that both localized and regional pollution is regulated at the air basin level, the Basin is the resource study area for the purposes of air quality.

The Basin experiences chronic exceedances of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and California Ambient Air Quality Standards and is currently in nonattainment status for O₃ (federal and state standards), PM₁₀ (state standards only), and PM_{2.5} (federal and state standards). Consequently, cumulative development in the Basin as a whole could violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, resulting in a significant cumulative impact. Based on SCAQMD's cumulative air quality impact methodology, SCAQMD recommends that if an individual project results in air emissions of criteria pollutants that exceed SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts, then it would also result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of these criteria pollutants for which the Project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Conversely, if a project's emissions do not exceed the recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts, its impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would not contribute to nonattainment of applicable air quality standards in the Basin.

As previously discussed under in section IV(A) above and in Threshold AQ-1 in Section 3.1, *Air Quality*, of the Draft EIR, the Project would not be consistent with the AQMP, which is intended to bring the Basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants. Daily construction emissions generated by the Project could exceed SCAQMD's daily significance thresholds and operation could result in long-term regional emissions of criteria air pollutants and O₃ precursors that could exceed SCAQMD's applicable thresholds. Exceedance of these thresholds could obstruct SCAQMD's efforts to achieve attainment of ambient air quality standards for criteria pollutants for which it is currently not in attainment (i.e., O₃, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}), or jeopardize the current attainment status of the Basin for other criteria pollutants. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-AQ-2** and **MM-AQ-3** would ensure the Project is reducing emissions during construction and operation; however, the impact would still be considered significant and unavoidable. Additionally, the changes that would occur with implementation of the Project would result in additional growth above what is assumed in GP 2025 and in SCAG's growth assumptions in the 2016 RTP/SCS, which were used to develop the emissions inventory in the 2016 AQMP. Therefore, future development under the Project would exceed SCAG's projections in the 2016 RTP/SCS upon which the regional emissions inventory for the Basin in the AQMP was based, and the Project could interfere with attainment in the Basin, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact. However, even with incorporation of mitigation, impacts from the Project would be considered cumulatively significant.

The other local and infrastructure development occurring within the City and nearby areas of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties and the adjacent cities of Norco, Jurupa Valley, Moreno Valley, Colton, Corona, and Grand Terrace would also be required to undergo environmental review under CEQA, which would include analyzing

the potential environmental impacts associated with air quality and identification of mitigation measures in the event significant environmental impacts are identified (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-2 to 3.16-3).

B. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The geographic extent for considering Project-related cumulative impacts on biological resources includes the City limits and the extent of similar habitat within the region because this distance encompasses a reasonable representative range for populations of sensitive species, such as special-status species and nesting birds, identified in the impact analysis for the Project. The scope for considering cumulative impacts on biological resources includes cumulative projects in the region that could potentially have an adverse effect on special-status plant and wildlife species, sensitive natural communities, protected wetlands or non-wetland waters of the U.S., local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and/or adopted habitat conservation plans (HCPs)/multiple-species habitat conservation plans (MSHCPs).

Future development facilitated by the Project along with other cumulative projects could include ground disturbance and vegetation removal (including mature trees and shrubs), resulting in potential direct and indirect impacts on special-status plant and wildlife species, nesting birds, sensitive natural communities, wetlands and potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources, wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites, and adopted HCPs/MSHCPs. Impacts from the Project would be less than significant for all of these biological resources with implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** and individual project-specific consistency with the WRC MSHCP. Similar measures would be applied for other cumulative projects in the region as needed to comply with the WRC MSHCP and minimize individual project impacts.

Construction of development facilitated by the Project could potentially affect special-status plant and/or wildlife species, including WRC MSHCP covered species, through the permanent removal and temporary disturbance of suitable habitat, as well as introduction of temporary indirect disturbance from construction-related activities. Development under the Project would be required to comply with all applicable laws and regulations related to special-status species. Moreover, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** (Impact BIO-1) and would ensure that individual development projects are consistent with the WRC MSHCP so that impacts on special-status plant and wildlife species, including WRC MSHCP covered species, would be less than significant. Other similar projects in the geographic area considered for the cumulative impact analysis would also be required to comply with all applicable laws and regulations related to special-status species, including obtaining all required regulatory permits and achieving consistency with the WRC MSHCP, and would implement similar mitigation measures for any impacts incurred with development of sites in the City and the larger region for the Project and other cumulative projects. Therefore, the Project, in combination with other projects within the cumulative context, would not result in a cumulative significant impact on special-status species.

Project implementation also could have direct and indirect impacts on sensitive natural communities as a result of construction of future development. However, impacts are expected to be minor given the placement of the Opportunity Sites within urban, developed areas. In addition, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** and would ensure that individual development projects are consistent with the WRC MSHCP so that impacts on biological resources would be less than significant. Similar measures would be applied for other cumulative projects in the region to reduce impacts, and other cumulative projects would be required to comply with all applicable regulatory permitting requirements and to be consistent with the WRC MSHCP prior to construction. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts on sensitive natural communities would occur with implementation of the Project and other cumulative projects within the geographic context.

Project implementation could have direct and indirect impacts on potential federal and state jurisdictional aquatic features and/or WRC MSHCP-designated Riparian/Riverine habitats as a result of construction of future development under the Housing Element Update and brush clearing under the Public Safety Element. However, should these features be determined to be jurisdictional, then future development facilitated by the Project would be required to comply with all applicable sections of the Clean Water Act, as well as with state and local streambed and stormwater regulations and applicable permit conditions. In addition, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** and would ensure that individual development projects are consistent with the WRC MSHCP so that impacts on aquatic resources would be less than significant. Similar measures would be applied for other cumulative projects in the region to reduce impacts in compliance with permit requirements from resource agencies like the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and California Department of Fish and Wildlife, as well as consistency with the WRC MSHCP. Therefore, the Project, in combination with other projects within the cumulative context, would not result in significant cumulative impacts on wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources.

Construction of development facilitated by the Project may result in temporary changes to wildlife nursery sites (i.e., native resident and/or migratory nesting birds) due to tree and shrub removal and indirect disturbance from construction and brush clearing-related activities (e.g., noise, increased human presence). Impacts on wildlife nursery sites would be localized and indirect disturbance would be temporary in nature. Nesting habitat for birds would also not be substantially reduced. The Project would implement Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** and would ensure that individual development projects are consistent with the WRC MSHCP so that any potential impacts on nesting birds from construction or brush-clearing activities that could result from the Project would be avoided or minimized. As such, Project impacts on wildlife nursery sites would be less than significant. Wildlife movement corridors, including WRC MSHCP cores and linkages, would not be directly or indirectly affected under either the Housing Element Update or Public Safety Element Update, because construction is not proposed as this is a programmatic document and as the Opportunity Sites are proposed within previously urbanized areas of the City. Therefore, the Project, in combination with other projects within the cumulative context, would not result significant cumulative impacts on wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources.

After implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-BIO-1** and individual development project compliance and consistency with the WRC MSHCP, construction of the development facilitated by the Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state HCP. Like the Project, cumulative projects in the region would be expected to comply with provisions, goals, and objectives of any HCPs within the Project region and pay any necessary fees associated with those HCPs. Therefore, the Project would not result in a cumulatively significant impact on the goals of any adopted HCPs, including the Western Riverside County MSHCP and Stephens' Kangaroo Rat HCP.

For the reasons discussed previously, the Project, in combination with other projects within the geographic context, would not substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of any special-status plant or wildlife species, damage or destroy any sensitive natural communities, harm protected wetlands or non-wetland waters of the U.S., threaten to reduce or eliminate a wildlife nursery site, or conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, and no significant cumulative impact would occur (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-3 to 3.16-5).

C. CULTURAL RESOURCES

The geographic scope of analysis for the cumulative cultural resource impacts varies for archaeological and built historical resources. For archaeological resources, the geographic scope includes the City, the larger region encompassing the City, and several surrounding cities and communities that compose the settled area of the various Native American tribes that inhabited this region. Archaeological resources are within the City limits and

throughout the surrounding region and can be affected both directly and indirectly as a result of increased development related to the Project. The geographic context for analysis of built historical resources depends on the type of resource but generally includes the City because built historical resources are present all throughout the City, including on and adjacent to Opportunity Sites. In addition, the Innovation District contains several clusters of historic buildings.

A significant cumulative impact on cultural resources would result if the Project, in combination with the effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the City and the larger region, would contribute to cumulative impacts on significant built historical resources, archaeological resources, and/or inadvertently discovered human remains. The Opportunity Sites are scattered throughout the City and future development related to the Project could affect built historical and archaeological resources.

Construction at Opportunity Sites could involve impacts on archaeological resources whether previously known or newly discovered during construction. Indirect impacts on archaeological sites can include increased pedestrian traffic on known archaeological sites due to increased population density. Additionally, increases in population density can require infrastructure that might affect archaeological resources both within the City and regionally. Such impacts on archaeological sites could occur at the locations of Opportunity Sites specifically and at other locations within the City or larger region. Future development projects occurring on Opportunity Sites such as in historic districts or the Innovation District could also include demolition or material alteration of known built historical resources; structural reuse requiring rehabilitation, restoration, reconstruction, and/or additions; or new construction or infill that has the potential to change the local landscape by modifying the setting of nearby built historical resources. Such construction could similarly occur on newly identified, or potential and previously unstudied, built historical resources.

The cumulative effects of multiple planned projects in the City and the larger region in combination with development at Opportunity Sites could mean cumulative adverse effects on archaeological resources. Such effects could include increases in vehicular and pedestrian traffic, increased population and more robust use of roadways and open space, and increased access to archaeological sites, resulting in the potential for looting or defacement of the physical components of archaeological resources. These direct and indirect impacts could cause adverse effects on the characteristics of known and unknown archaeological resources. Direct impacts could include complete removal of features and cultural constituents on portions of sites and removal of yet-undocumented potential subsurface components relating to construction activities. Indirect impacts include loss of setting, loss of traditional viewsheds, and increases in noise and vehicular and pedestrian traffic. As such, the Project, in combination with other planned projects in the City and in the larger region, could result in adverse cumulative effects on known and unknown archaeological resources eligible for the CRHR that might be identified within the proposed development locations. Therefore, the incremental impacts of the Project—when considered with past, present, and future projects in the Project vicinity—would result in a significant cumulative impact on archaeological resources.

Ground-disturbing activities associated with construction at Opportunity Sites could result in the discovery of previously unidentified archaeological resources and destruction of known archaeological resources. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-CUL-2** through **MM-CUL-9**. Therefore, the contribution of the Project to the cumulative impact on archaeological resources and human remains would be cumulatively considerable.

Cumulative impacts on historic resources could occur if the Project in combination with other development within the City results in adverse effects on previously identified CEQA historical resources as well as buildings that have not yet been surveyed or evaluated as potential historical resources and are over 50 years old at the time of development. Adverse effects could include a reduction in the number, intensity, concentration, and integrity of a certain historical property type or architectural style within the geographic context. However, all

development is subject to the City's Cultural Resources Ordinance (Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code) and Historic Preservation Element of the GP 2025, which provide a process and policies for the protection and preservation of eligible and designated built historical resources. These would continue to apply to present and reasonably foreseeable future projects within the City.

The Project would be subject to implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-1**, which would require historical resource assessments to identify buildings that meet applicable criteria as historical resources, and compliance with Title 20 (Cultural Resources) of the Riverside Municipal Code to minimize potential impacts on historic resources. Similar measures would be applied to other projects within the City that occur outside of the Opportunity Sites. Because development under the Project and throughout the City would be subject to these requirements to avoid or minimize impacts on historic resources, a cumulative impact on built historical resources from past, present, and future projects would not occur (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-5 to 3.16-7).

D. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

All significant paleontological resources are unique and nonrenewable resources. Unlike archaeological resources, which are site-specific, paleontological resources can occur throughout a sensitive geologic unit, regardless of location. Therefore, the geographic context for paleontological resources encompasses the complete extent of geologic units with high or undetermined paleontological sensitivity that underlie the Project. It is likely that significant paleontological resources in these geologic units have been and could in the future be destroyed by development. Therefore, a cumulative impact on paleontological resources in the geographic context exists.

Development in the geographic context has removed the upper layers of geologic units in many areas and replaced it with artificial fill. However, this fill is underlain in many areas by geologic units of high or undetermined paleontological sensitivity at varying depths below ground surface. Therefore, the Project, in combination with other foreseeable development in the identified geographic context, has the potential to encounter and damage or destroy previously unknown paleontological resources during both construction and operation. However, Mitigation Measures **MM-PAL-1**, **MM-PAL-2**, and **MM-PAL-3**—which would require individual projects to conduct paleontological resource investigations, avoid paleontological resources or conduct monitoring, and avoid/minimize impacts on paleontological resources during operations—would avoid or minimize the Project's impacts on paleontological resources to the extent that the contribution of the Project to the cumulative impact on paleontological resources would not be considerable (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-7).

E. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

GHG emissions and climate change are exclusively cumulative impacts; as climate change is the result of cumulative global emissions, there are no non-cumulative GHG emissions impacts from a climate change perspective. No single project, when considered in isolation, can cause climate change because a single project's emissions are not enough to change the radiative balance of the atmosphere. Because climate change is the result of GHG emissions and GHGs are emitted by innumerable sources worldwide, global climate change will have a significant cumulative impact on the natural environment as well as human development and activity. As such, GHGs and climate change are cumulatively considerable, even though the contribution may be individually limited.

As discussed in Section 3.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, the Project would contribute GHG emissions to the cumulative condition. Equipment and vehicles used during construction (e.g., on-road motor vehicles and heavy equipment) and operations (e.g., vehicle trips, electricity consumption, and waste generation) would result in a net increase in GHG emissions over existing conditions and over what is currently proposed in GP 2025. As

discussed under Impact GHG-1 and shown in Table 3.5-8 in Section 3.5, implementation of the Project would result in emissions that would be below the numerical efficiency target for horizon year 2029. This target was developed with best available data and represents the emissions level the Project would need to achieve to align with the statewide GHG reduction goals established by SB 32 for 2030. However, because the City has not adopted a qualified GHG reduction plan (per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5) that meets the statewide GHG goal established by SB 32 for 2030, it cannot be stated with certainty that the Project would result in emissions that would represent a fair share of the requisite reductions toward the statewide 2030 target.

Additionally, the Project would not fully comply with local and statewide plans, policies, and regulatory programs outlined in GP 2025 the adopted California 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan, and plans adopted or recommended by the California Air Resources Board or other California agencies for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Notably, the Project would result in increased VMT that exceed the California Air Resources Board's regional VMT target necessary to achieve the state's long-term GHG emissions-reduction trajectory. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-TRA-1** and **MM-GHG-1** through **MM-GHG-3** would be required to reduce GHG emissions from the Project during construction and operation, and ensure compliance with local and statewide plans, policies, and regulatory programs designed to reduce GHG emissions. Similar measures would be applied for other cumulative projects in the region to reduce impacts. However, even after incorporation of mitigation, the Project could result in a cumulatively considerable impact related to GHG emissions because it may impede achievement of state reduction targets.

As this Project would exceed GHG thresholds and there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions to a less-than-significant level, the Project would still have a cumulatively significant and unavoidable impact (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-7 to 3.16-8).

F. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative impacts with regard to hazards and hazardous materials is the City, including contaminated sites throughout the City. Development as an indirect result of the Project would have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, if, in combination with other projects within the City, it creates a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions; involves emissions/handling of hazardous materials or acutely hazardous materials and/or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school; or is on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

In general, cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials are most often associated with commercial or industrial land uses rather than residential and mixed-use development. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects could result in significant hazardous material impacts if they are on a hazardous material site or include industrial activities that could result in soil or ground contamination. Hazardous materials in California are highly regulated, primarily by the Department of Toxic Substances Control but also by the California Environmental Protection Agency. Numerous federal, state, and local regulations govern the use, generation, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials. The State of California also has several programs to prevent accidental releases of toxic contaminants and require the preparation of Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans.

Furthermore, projects and plans that do not substantially increase the potential for industrial activity are not considered to generate cumulatively significant impacts. Therefore, direct and indirect development as a result of the Project would result in a low potential for hazardous material risk. Any future development (as a direct or indirect result of the Project or other development projects within the City) would be required to comply with

applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to the handling, disposal, and remediation of hazardous materials. For the Project, this would include implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-HAZ-1** and compliance with applicable regulations and programs. Therefore, the Project, in combination with other projects within the geographic context, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to hazards and hazardous materials (Draft EIR p. 3.16-8).

G. LAND USE AND PLANNING

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative land use impacts includes the cities adjacent to Riverside—Norco, Corona, Grand Terrace, Jurupa Valley, Moreno Valley, and Colton—as well as adjacent portions of unincorporated western Riverside County. The general plans of these jurisdictions were reviewed to provide a foundation for planned cumulative growth in this geographic context.

The Project has the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable impact on land use and planning, if, in combination with other projects within the Inland Empire, it would cause a conflict with adopted land use goals, objectives, or policies of applicable land use plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact. The cumulative growth and development in the Inland Empire are expected to be largely consistent with the land use plans that have been established to guide and regulate growth patterns and infrastructure improvements and are not expected to conflict with those plans. Regional planning documents, such as SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS, are used for planning within the Inland Empire. However, some strategies may not be consistent with the general plans of city and county areas when it comes to land use patterns and development intensities. On a local level, goals and policies in the local jurisdictions' general plans supersede strategies in the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS. Therefore, past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development is not anticipated to conflict with land use plans and policies and no significant cumulative impact would occur.

Cumulative development would be evaluated at the project level when individual projects are proposed, including undergoing the plan review process for consistency with adopted land use plans and policies in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, California Zoning and Planning Law, and the California Subdivision Map Act, all of which require findings of plan and policy consistency prior to approval of entitlements for development. Each cumulative project would be analyzed independently and within the context of its respective land use and regulatory settings. Therefore, past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development is anticipated to be consistent with land use plans and policies and no significant cumulative condition exists.

The Project would assist the City in meeting its state-required RHNA obligations and would update the existing Housing Element so that it is fully compliant with current state housing law. The Project would not physically divide an established community, as the Project would focus development in already urbanized parts of the City, near existing infrastructure, rather than spreading growth to the urban fringes, and no major roadway (e.g., expressway or freeway) that would traverse an existing community or neighborhood is proposed under the Project. All development facilitated by the Project would be processed in accordance with GP 2025 and the Riverside Municipal Code. The proposed rezoning identifies Opportunity Sites, which would permit multi-family residential and mixed-use development by right pursuant to California Government Code Section 65583.2(h) (e.g., without a Conditional Use Permit, Planned Unit Development Permit, or other discretionary action). Therefore, the impact of the Project on land use along with other cumulative development in adjacent cities and the county would be less than cumulatively considerable (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-9).

H. NOISE

The geographic context for the cumulative noise analysis is the City. Development of new residential or mixed-used development could increase both stationary and mobile sources of noise from HVAC and other equipment, as well as vehicles. Construction activities could also generate significant cumulative noise and vibration effects if in proximity to one another or in combination with operational or vehicular noise.

Vibration generated by construction equipment has the potential to be substantial and exceed the Federal Transit Administration criteria for human annoyance and structural damage, if construction occurred in close proximity to other construction. Therefore, both construction and operation activities could expose sensitive receptors to excessive noise or groundborne vibration, constituting a significant impact. Consequently, implementation of the Project in combination with other projects within the City would result in a cumulative impact related to noise and vibration.

Any future development facilitated by the Project would be required to comply with City requirements for both construction and operational noise and vibration, including those within the Riverside Municipal Code, GP 2025, and City standard conditions of approval. Individual projects also would likely prescribe project-specific mitigation measures that would reduce individual project-related impacts. Construction-related vibration impacts generally would be localized to the area where construction activities would take place, and would occur within the times prescribed by the Riverside Municipal Code, which exempts construction noise from established noise level limits within prescribed timeframes. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative noise and vibration impact related to construction.

Build-out of the Opportunity Sites facilitated by the Project, along with other projects throughout the City, would result in noise level increases throughout the local roadway networks (Table 3.8-16). Impacts from stationary operational noise sources also would occur with build-out associated with the Project in combination with other development throughout the City. As noise generated by a stationary noise source, or “point source,” decreases by approximately 6 dBA over hard surfaces (e.g., reflective surfaces, such as parking lots or smooth bodies of water) and 7.5 dBA over soft surfaces (e.g., absorptive surfaces, such as soft dirt, grass, or scattered bushes and trees) for each doubling of the distance, it is reasonable to assume that new stationary noise sources associated with new projects would have to be located next to each other. Together with impacts associated with increased roadway noise, this increase in noise from stationary sources would result in a cumulative noise impact.

While roadway noise increases associated with the Project would be on the order of 0.5 dB or less, the Project contribution would be considered cumulatively considerable. If future development within the Opportunity Sites were to occur in close proximity to other new development projects, the Project’s contribution to noise from stationary noise sources could also be considered cumulatively considerable. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-NOI-1** through **MM-NOI-3** would reduce potential Project impacts. However, even with the inclusion of mitigation measures, impacts from the Project could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative noise and vibration impacts (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-9 to 3.16-10).

I. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative population and housing impacts is the area covered by SCAG, the metropolitan planning organization responsible for demographic growth projections for the six-county region encompassing Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside and Imperial Counties, and includes the City. The basis for this cumulative analysis is the 2020–2045 SCAG RTP/SCS. The individual general plans for the adjacent cities of Norco, Corona, Grand Terrace, Colton, Jurupa Valley, and Moreno Valley and adjacent areas of unincorporated Riverside County were also considered.

Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project – CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations

The Project has the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable impact on population and housing if, in combination with other projects within the SCAG region, it would induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure) or displace a substantial number of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Past projects in the SCAG region have converted undeveloped and agricultural land to urban uses, resulting in residential and employment population increases. Currently, there is no question that there is an ongoing housing crisis throughout California. A variety of measures indicate the extent of the crisis, including overcrowding and cost-burdened households, but the underlying cause is insufficient housing supply together with continuing population growth over recent decades. Planning documents, such as general plans prepared by cities, generally reflect the growth projections in SCAG's 2020–2045 RTP/SCS. Build-out under the RTP/SCS would consist of a variety of land uses, including roadway improvements, residential development, habitat reconstruction, water treatment and infrastructure, commercial development, and recreation, which could reasonably be expected to contribute to population increases in the region. While general plans in the cumulative geographic context aim to be consistent with regional growth projections, given the current housing shortage and the high RHNA obligations for the 6th cycle, it is reasonably foreseeable that future cumulative development could exceed growth projections of the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS. For example, Colton would exceed growth projections of the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS based on its RHNA obligation and it is anticipated that at least some other cities within the SCAG region would similarly result in exceedances of growth projections.

Development pursuant to the Project would result in a further increase in the population and available housing stock within the City. The population increase from the Project would exceed growth forecasts within SCAG's 2020–2045 RTP/SCS. There is no feasible mitigation available to reduce this impact. Consequently, the Project would make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on population and housing. Therefore, impacts of the Project on population and housing would be cumulatively considerable and the impact would be cumulatively significant (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-10 to 3.16-11).

J. PUBLIC SERVICES

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative impacts with regard to public services is the local service areas within the City for police and fire services, schools, and libraries. Riverside Fire Department provides fire protection for the City. Riverside Fire Department's major facilities include 14 fire stations throughout the City, administration and prevention offices, an Emergency Operations Center, and a training center. Riverside County Fire Department provides service to the unincorporated territory within the City's SOI. Four Riverside Police Department stations serve the City. The City is served by two public school districts: Riverside Unified School District, which has 47 schools, and Alvord Unified School District, which has 23 schools. In addition, portions of the City lie within the Moreno Valley Unified School District (MVUSD), although no existing MVUSD facilities nor significant residential land uses are located in these parts of the City. The Riverside Public Library system maintains eight existing libraries that serve the City. Four university and college libraries also serve the City.

Past and present development has resulted in increased population, which in turn has resulted in an increase in demand for all public services. Growth in the City to date has been consistent with the growth projections in the City's GP 2025. Each of the public service providers conducts an annual budgeting process where future facility/staffing needs are identified. Because past and present development is consistent with growth identified in GP 2025 and there are mechanisms in place to ensure provision of adequate service, there would be no significant cumulative condition with respect to public services within the defined geographic area.

The Opportunity Sites are located throughout the City and future development pursuant to the Project would increase demand and affect the provision of public services and facilities. Compliance with state and local regulations as well as established budgeting processes would ensure that there would be sufficient facilities and services to accommodate additional public services resulting from development and associated population growth facilitated by the Project. While there are no development impact fees that would fund the Riverside Public Library system, compliance with GP 2025 would help ensure that future development would not affect the City's ability to provide adequate library services. Should population growth associated with the Project, and more broadly within the cumulative context, necessitate the expansion of existing libraries or construction of new facilities, the impacts of such development would be analyzed at a project-specific level.

As additional development occurs in the geographic context, there would be an overall increase in the demand for public services, which could cause physical deterioration of existing facilities. Future development facilitated by the Project would be consistent with GP 2025 and new policies from the Public Safety Element Update. However, increases in demand are routinely assessed by fire and law enforcement agencies as part of the budgeting processes, as noted, and law enforcement and fire protection services are anticipated to be adequate to accommodate future growth in the City. This is partially accomplished through collection of development impact fees. Similarly, school districts routinely assess increases in growth and would ensure that there would be sufficient school facilities to accommodate associated population growth through collection of development impact fees. Other cumulative projects in the Inland Empire would also require collection of development impact fees to accommodate increases in demand for public services. Such fees would be utilized to help fund construction of required new or expanded facilities, and the impacts of such development would be analyzed at a project-specific level.

Cumulative related projects pursuant to build-out of general plans and CIPs in the Inland Empire consist of a variety of developments, including roadway improvements, residential development, habitat reconstruction, water treatment and infrastructure, electrical infrastructure, airport improvements, commercial development, and recreation, among others. All cumulative projects would be consistent with the applicable land use plans and CIPs. Public service providers in the cumulative context have similar annual budgeting processes to assess the adequacy of facilities and staffing. Furthermore, as development of new and expanded library, school, fire, and police facilities would be required to go through the applicable local entitlement and approval processes, including CEQA review, such development is expected to occur in a manner that would avoid cumulative impacts. Any significant impacts would be disclosed and mitigated, as feasible, at a project-specific level. Therefore, the cumulative public services impact would be less than significant. Consequently, the Project, in combination with cumulative projects in the defined geographic context, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on public services (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-13 to 3.16-14).

K. RECREATION

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative impacts on recreation is the City, as this geographic area contains the regional, community, and neighborhood recreational resources most used by local residents and visitors. Population growth from past and present development in the City has led to an increased demand for neighborhood, community, and regional parks and recreational facilities. The City has a goal of 2 acres of community, 1 acre of neighborhood park, and 5 acres overall per 1,000 residents. City parkland ratio goals versus parkland ratios with implementation of the Project would decrease the parkland-to-resident ratio. The existing parkland-to-resident ratio is 7.91 acres per 1,000 residents citywide, and implementation of the Housing Element Update would result in 6.07 acres per 1,000 residents citywide.

Implementation of the Project in the City has the potential to increase population to the point where parkland-to-resident ratios are exceeded, and overuse and deterioration of existing parks and recreational facilities could

occur. As noted in Section 3.11, Recreation, the deterioration that would occur to neighborhood parks and recreational facilities from population growth in the City may be offset with funding from new development such as in-lieu fees for parks or donation of parkland pursuant to the Quimby Act. The Quimby Act is a funding mechanism for parkland acquisition for jurisdictions. As allowed by this act, the City has park dedication ordinances as part of its municipal code, which require most residential subdivisions to dedicate parkland or pay in-lieu fees to enable the City to acquire parkland. To accommodate future demand for park and recreational facilities from implementation of the Project in the City, additional park and recreational facilities would be developed and constructed throughout the City, including those future projects listed in Section 3.11.

Cumulative development throughout the City would incrementally increase the need for new or expanded facilities, which would have the potential to result in adverse environmental effects. Such effects would be assessed on a project-specific basis, with individual projects undergoing separate CEQA analysis and proposing mitigation, as needed to address potential impacts. As such, the Project, in combination with cumulative projects defined in the geographic context, would not result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to parks and recreation in the City (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-14).

L. TRANSPORTATION

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative transportation impacts considers total development within the City plus regional growth consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS as represented in the Riverside County Traffic Analysis Model forecasting model. The cumulative condition considers full build-out of GP 2025 and the City's CIP as it relates to roadway improvements in addition to the RTP/SCS financially constrained transportation improvements.

The Project, in combination with other projects in the City, would result in an increase in VMT. The Project would result in an increase in the total origin-destination VMT compared to the base year, which exceeds the City's VMT threshold of significance. The Project would also result in an increase in VMT within the City boundary with the addition of the Project in the base and future years. These are both attributable to the fact that the Project would increase population and employment within the City, which would increase VMT. However, the VMT per service population would decrease within the City, showing that travel on a per-person basis would be more efficient with the addition of the Project. Given the uncertainty in some components that influence VMT (such as the cost of fuel) combined with the City's inability to influence other measures that would have the largest effect on VMT (such as implementation of a VMT tax or an increase in the fuel tax), the effectiveness of Transportation Demand Management measures to mitigate VMT cannot be guaranteed to reduce impacts and the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. Together with other projects within the cumulative context, this would result in a significant cumulative impact.

Project implementation is not expected to substantially increase the number of individuals using the airport facilities at Riverside Municipal Airport, Flabob Airport, or March Air Reserve Base. The Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns or in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the City. Other future projects would be required to also analyze and minimize impacts related to airport facilities.

Project implementation could result in inadequate emergency access. The City continues to implement adopted road standards and, as a result, new roadways would be designed to avoid unsafe design and provide adequate emergency access. The City has an Emergency Operations Plan, and the Riverside Fire Department provides response management through activation of the Standardized Emergency Management System. GP 2025 also provides policies to identify methods of implementing the emergency plan. Additionally, the Public Safety Element Update as part of the Project would address emergency preparedness and response, including through provision of high-quality and responsive emergency management services to all residents and businesses in the

City. All projects within the City would be required to comply with these plans and policies, which would minimize any impacts related to emergency access.

Implementation of the Project as well as other cumulative projects in the City would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Major principles for the Project include focusing future development near existing transportation corridors, ensuring land uses are supported by an efficient local roadway network, and supporting alternative modes of transportation such as walking, biking, and transit. GP 2025 and the Project and their relevant policies would support, rather than conflict with, policies, plans, and programs concerning alternative transportation, thereby limiting impact of the Project and other projects within the City.

Implementation of the Project, in conjunction with other cumulative projects, would result in less-than-significant impacts following compliance with the specified GP 2025 policies and applicable regulations for hazards due to a design feature, emergency access, and policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, as concluded above. All future development in the City would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for consistency with applicable regulatory requirements, including GP 2025 goals and policies and Riverside Municipal Code standards, intended to reduce and/or avoid potential impacts involving transportation and traffic. Cumulative impacts on transportation and traffic would be mitigated on a project-by-project level, and in accordance with the established regulatory framework, through the established regulatory review process.

Mitigation Measure **MM-TRA-1** could reduce VMT, but the effectiveness would vary by type and location of future specific projects, and outside influences on travel such as the price of fuel cannot be fully controlled. Consequently, the Project would make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on transportation. Therefore, impacts of the Project on transportation would be cumulatively considerable and the impact would be cumulatively significant (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-15 to 3.16-16).

M. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

The geographic scope for an analysis of cumulative impacts on TCRs includes the City, the larger region encompassing the City, and several surrounding cities and communities that compose the settled area of the various Native American tribes that inhabited this region. A cumulatively considerable impact on TCRs would result if, in combination with build-out of the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future plans, the Project's incremental contribution to significant cumulative TCR impacts would be considerable.

Opportunity Sites and surrounding areas consist of urban land that has been almost entirely developed with buildings, roadways, or park landscape. Therefore, due to the nature of the Project, it is unlikely that significant TCRs would be encountered during implementation at Opportunity Sites. Any potential TCRs inadvertently discovered during construction activities would be evaluated and protected in compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52. However, past projects within the geographic scope have resulted in the urban development seen today, which most likely also affected TCRs that were previously within those projects' footprints. Because the past and present projects have drastically changed the cultural setting of the immediate region, cumulative impacts from past, present, and probable future projects could be cumulatively significant.

The impacts from past development projects on TCRs is unknown; however, they are assumed to have occurred, as cultural resource laws and regulations were not in place when much of the City was developed. TCRs can be sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, or sacred places, and it is assumed that such features existed within the boundaries of the City. Given the known existence of TCRs through oral histories and statements from Native American tribes that occupied and continue to occupy this region, it is assumed that some TCRs may have been affected by past development. While individual present and future projects may not affect known TCRs, it

is possible that currently unknown TCRs such as buried archaeological sites, sacred features, or as-yet-undefined cultural landscapes could be affected. The possibility that the Project and subsequent development within the geographic context could affect currently unknown TCRs, in combination with the impacts of past projects which are assumed to have occurred, would result in a potential cumulative impact on TCRs.

A search of the Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File was positive for cultural resources. While it is unknown where these resources are located, as this information is kept confidential by the Native American Heritage Commission, it is likely that they would be considered TCRs. Additionally, the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians has indicated that the area is culturally sensitive and identified types of resources that exist in the City that could be considered TCRs. The Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians also indicated that the Project is in proximity to known sites, is within a shared use area involved in intertribal trade, and is considered culturally sensitive by the people of Soboba. As discussed in Section 3.13, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, significant TCRs are potentially present within portions of the City, though it is unknown whether such TCRs are located at specific Opportunity Sites and whether such TCRs are listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC 5020.1(k). It is likely, however, that resources such as those described by Pechanga (rock art, pictographs, and petroglyphs) would be considered eligible TCRs and are likely to be identified as such.

Demolition and construction of new structures associated with development of Opportunity Sites could include varying depths of excavation and ground disturbance, and similar activities would likely occur with other development within the geographic context. If ground-disturbing activities were to occur in areas identified as sensitive by Native American tribes, these activities could damage or destroy TCRs, which would be a significant impact. In addition, ground-disturbing activities associated with each of these categories could damage or destroy currently undiscovered TCRs, which would also be a significant impact.

While a significant cumulative impact on TCRs would occur within the geographic context, the Project's contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable with implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-CUL-2** through **MM-CUL-9**, **MM-TCR-1**, and **MM-TCR-2**. As described in Section 3.13, these measures would reduce the impacts of the Project to a less-than-significant level by requiring consultation with the City (by the applicant) and tribal representatives prior to issuance of a grading permit; implementation of TCR protocols and measures determined through consultation with tribes; preparation of archaeological studies, treatment plans, and monitoring; and implementation of data recovery procedures. These measures would help avoid or minimize Project effects on TCRs to the extent that the Project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be minimal (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-16 to 3.16-17).

N. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The geographic context for cumulative impacts from the Project on utilities and service systems is the local utility service areas for the individual providers. For the cumulative impact analysis for water sources and supplies, stormwater, and solid waste, this consists of the City and areas within the City's SOI. The geographic context for cumulative impact analysis of electricity is the Southern California Edison service area, which provides electricity for the City's SOI and provides the interconnection to the state's transmission grid to Riverside Public Utilities (RPU), the City's main electric power provider. The geographic context for the cumulative impact analysis of natural gas is the Southern California Gas Company service area.

Water: A majority of the City is within the RPU service area, while the southeasterly portion is within the Western Municipal Water District (WMWD) service area. Water for the City is mainly supplied by RPU. According to the WMWD Urban Water Management Plan, WMWD's supplies exceed demands for normal year and multiple dry-year conditions through 2040. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development

would result in increased demand for water. While there is a statewide drought condition, the supply for the WMWD service area is adequate to accommodate growth through 2040. There would be no significant cumulative condition with respect to water supply.

Implementation of the Project would facilitate the development of the Opportunity Sites, thereby resulting in more demand for water resources over existing conditions. The increased demand would not be accommodated in accordance with the 2015 RPU Urban Water Management Plan (as well as the recently adopted 2020 Urban Water Management Plan). However, none of the groundwater basins from which RPU extracts water from are currently in a critical overdraft condition. Adverse environmental impacts are not expected from the use of groundwater sources because groundwater extraction would be within the safe yield of the groundwater basin. However, construction activities associated with future development would be subject to compliance with local, state, and federal laws, ordinances, and regulations necessary to ensure construction-related impacts are not significant. Therefore, the future increase in demand for water supply from implementation of the Project would not result in the extension, relocation, and expansion of new water facilities and the impact would be less than significant.

Cumulative projects would also be required to coordinate demands with the capacity of the water system and work with RPU and WMWD to coordinate water services. While full build-out of the Project could result in an increase in demand in exceedance of the 2015 RPU Urban Water Management Plan projections, groundwater use augments supply for future projects that is provided by RPU and WMWD. Additionally, in compliance with SB 221 and SB 610 requirements, future development that meets certain size thresholds would require preparation of a water supply assessment in order to verify sufficient water supply is available to meet future development's water demand. Future development would also be required to fund fair-share costs associated with the provision of water, and to ensure that the provision of water is consistent with the growth planned for the City including the SOI, working with other providers (GP 2025 Policies PF-1.3 and PF 1.4). In addition, existing GP 2025 Final Programmatic EIR Mitigation Measure UTL-1 requires the City to periodically review population and development trends with respect to water sources and supply to ensure that growth facilitated by the Project can be accommodated with present and expected water sources. This would further reduce impacts related to the provision of water services for the Project and other cumulative projects within the geographic context. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative impact on water supply.

Wastewater Treatment: Riverside's wastewater treatment is provided by the City of Riverside Public Works Department's Riverside Regional Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP) and WMWD. The RWQCP provides preliminary, primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment with a hydraulic rated capacity of 46 million gallons per day (mgd) average dry-weather flow. As of 2020, the average daily influent flows are 25.3 mgd (0.54 percent capacity). Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority has a design capacity of 14 mgd and currently treats an average of approximately 8 mgd (or 0.57 percent capacity). The Western Water Recycling Facility has a capacity of 3 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 0.8 mgd (or 0.25 percent capacity). Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development have not resulted in inadequate capacity of the wastewater treatment system. As described in Section 3.14, there is remaining capacity for the City to meet the future increase in wastewater treatment demand within its service area.

Development facilitated by the Project could result in additional housing units that would cause increased demand for wastewater treatment services. At maximum build-out, the Project would generate an estimated 9.5 mgd within the City's wastewater service area, which would be adequately treated by the RWQCP because it would not exceed its treatment capacity of 46 mgd; an additional 0.5 mgd would be treated by WMWD facilities. It is anticipated that RWQCP and WMWD treatment facilities would be able to meet increased demand for wastewater. The RWQCP is scalable and expandable to handle both ongoing increased flows and seasonal fluctuations; ample space exists for any additional treatment capacity that may be needed in the future. The

wastewater collection system that conveys wastewater flows to the RWQCP as well as other treatment facilities in the local utility service areas for the individual providers can similarly be expanded to realize future capacity that may be needed. To serve future population growth facilitated by the Project, sewer lines would have to be expanded within the City; this could occur with other cumulative projects as well. While development of the Project and other projects within the geographic context would require extension, relocation, and expansion of new sewer lines within the City, construction activities associated with future development would be subject to compliance with local, state, and federal laws, ordinances, and regulations, as well as any Project-specific mitigation measures necessary to ensure construction-related impacts are not significant. Additionally, cumulative projects would undergo separate CEQA analyses and implement mitigation measures as necessary to reduce impacts on wastewater demand and ensure consistency with applicable wastewater management plans. For these reasons, the Project's impact, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact for wastewater treatment.

Stormwater: Regional stormwater drainage facilities within the City are managed by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. The City's smaller drainage facilities are maintained by the City. Past development has resulted in increases in impervious surfaces in the geographic context, causing an increase in stormwater runoff into storm drain systems. Past and present development has not resulted in inadequate capacity of the storm drain facilities in the system. Future development will comply with all applicable regulations related to stormwater, and therefore is not anticipated to change the cumulative condition. While development facilitated by the Project would require extension, relocation, and construction of new storm drain facilities within the City, construction activities associated with future development would be subject to compliance with local, state, and federal laws, ordinances, and regulations, as well as any Project-specific mitigation measures necessary to ensure construction-related impacts are not significant. Additionally, the cumulative projects would be required to conduct separate CEQA analyses and implement mitigation measures as necessary to reduce impacts on stormwater drainage facilities. All projects would comply with applicable regulations related to stormwater discharge. Therefore, the Project's impact, combined with the cumulative projects, would not result in a significant stormwater impact.

Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications Facilities: Electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications services are intended to support existing and future growth; that is, as demands grow, the related infrastructure grows. Service providers undertake extensive short- and long-term planning efforts coordinated throughout the state and with state agencies to ensure that there is adequate energy and telecommunications infrastructure in place to accommodate projected growth, including growth associated with expanding housing supply and jobs. Each of the utility providers routinely assesses demands and prepares comprehensive infrastructure plans and reports outlining the state of the resource and future needs. Because of the growth considered in these plans, reasonably foreseeable future development would similarly be accommodated by the utility providers. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative condition related to these utilities.

While development of the Project would require extension, relocation, and construction of above-ground and underground electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facility improvements within the City, construction activities associated with future development would be subject to compliance with local, state, and federal laws, ordinances, and regulations, as well as any Project-specific mitigation measures necessary to ensure construction-related impacts are not significant. In addition, even though growth under the Project would exceed SCAG growth projections, electrical, natural gas, and telecommunication service providers consider growth in their service areas in their infrastructure plans and through other projections and project-specific requests for service and do not simply rely on SCAG projections. Therefore, the impact of the Project on these dry utilities would be less than significant. Cumulative projects would be required to conduct separate CEQA analyses and implement mitigation measures as necessary to reduce impacts on dry utilities. The Project's impact would not be cumulatively considerable for electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications.

Solid Waste: The City's solid waste disposal needs are provided by City of Riverside Public Works Department Burrtec Waste Industries, Athens Services, and CR&R Waste Services. The City has a comprehensive waste management program that ensures projects comply with waste-reduction ordinances and programs. While there is a shortage of landfills statewide, recycling programs and regulations continue to evolve to help ensure adequate disposal capacity. Reasonably foreseeable future development would similarly comply with waste-reduction regulations. Development of the Project in conjunction with other cumulative projects within the geographic context for cumulative impacts would generate additional demand for solid waste services, depending on net increases in population, square footage, and intensification of uses. These projects would contribute to the overall regional demand for solid waste. Concurrent with the increased demand generated by past and present development, recycling programs are being improved and developed to reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in landfills. Such programs help offset the demand associated with waste-generating development. Additionally, cumulative projects would comply with all waste-reduction requirements and be required to conduct separate CEQA analyses and implement mitigation measures as necessary to reduce impacts on solid waste disposal capacity.

Future development associated with the Project would result in increased housing units and mixed-use development and new residents in the City, which would result in an increase in solid waste generation over existing conditions. Future development associated with the Project would result in an increase of up to 31,564 housing units and 103,530 new residents, which would result in an increase in solid waste generation over existing conditions. The Project would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Among the four landfills that would serve the Project, there is a remaining capacity of approximately 100 million cubic yards.

Cumulative related projects pursuant to build-out of general plans and CIPs in the Inland Empire consist of a variety of land uses, including roadway improvements, residential development, habitat reconstruction, water treatment and infrastructure, commercial development, and recreation, among others. As discussed in Section 3.14, Utilities and Service Systems, implementation of the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts on utilities and service systems throughout the City. Because the Project, along with other cumulative projects developed within the geographic context, would be compliant with all applicable regulatory and environmental review requirements to ensure that there is adequate capacity to meet the demand they generate, there would be no significant cumulative impact related to solid waste services (Draft EIR pp. 3.16-17 to 3.16-21).

VI. FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Pursuant to Section 15126.2(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must consider any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by a proposed project, should it be implemented. Section 15126.2(d) reads as follows:

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

A project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if:

- The primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses.
- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources.

- The project would involve uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project.
- The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves the wasteful use of energy).

Nonrenewable resources used during construction of future development facilitated by the Project would include construction materials and fuels to power construction equipment. However, as discussed in Section 3.15, *Effects Not Found to Be Significant*, the Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during Project construction or operation. Nonetheless, the resources used during implementation of the Project would be permanently committed to the Project and, therefore, their use would be irreversible.

The State CEQA Guidelines also require a discussion of the potential for irreversible environmental damage caused by an accident associated with a proposed project or an accidental release of hazardous materials. The Project would not involve the transport or storage of hazardous materials on site. Construction activities may include the temporary use of some hazardous agents, such as paints, oils, solvents, and cleansers, as well as temporary storage of these materials and fuel on site. However, the amounts of chemical agents typically used during construction would be limited. In addition, the residential and mixed-use development that would be facilitated by the Project is not anticipated to create hazards related to the release of hazardous materials. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-HAZ-1** would minimize impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials by requiring a project-level hazardous materials site assessment for construction of an individual project, which would verify the presence or absence of hazardous materials on any Opportunity Site and require subsequent measures if necessary.

VII. FINDINGS REGARDING GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

According to Section 15126.2(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines, growth-inducing impacts of a proposed project must be discussed in the EIR. Growth-inducing impacts are those effects of a proposed project that might foster economic or population growth or the construction of new housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. According to CEQA, increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects.

Induced growth is any growth that exceeds planned growth and results from new development that would not have taken place without implementation of a proposed project. Typically, the growth-inducing potential of a project would be considered significant if it results in growth or population concentration that exceeds those assumptions included in pertinent master plans, land use plans, or projections made by regional planning authorities. Growth may be induced through the provision of infrastructure or service capacity that would accommodate new development. Based on the definition of growth inducement, a general plan is inherently growth-inducing because it must, by law, accommodate at least projected housing demand. The GP 2025 update would provide the framework by which public officials (i.e., Riverside City Council) will be guided in making decisions relative to future development in the City. However, the creation of growth-inducing potential does not automatically lead to growth, whether it would be below or in exceedance of the projected level. Under CEQA, growth in any area is not necessarily assumed to be either beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

The Project does not include individual development proposals. However, as discussed below, because a part of the Project would include rezoning to allow for additional housing opportunities, it is anticipated that the Project would lead to additional growth. This EIR, by evaluating the impacts of implementation of the GP 2025 update for the Housing and Public Safety Elements, discloses its growth-inducing impacts. Future development facilitated by the Project would occur as market conditions allow and at the discretion of individual property

owners. Development of the Project would encourage a mix of market-rate, affordable rental, and affordable ownership housing and mixed-used development in both new construction and preserved or adaptively reused buildings, which is intended to increase housing of all types in the City, rather than create new housing for people outside of the City in order to meet the City's RHNA obligation. To do this, the Project identifies Opportunity Sites that could be suitable locations for future housing development and proposes rezoning of certain Opportunity Sites to allow higher-density residential and mixed-use development. The rezoning of Opportunity Sites has the potential to increase the City's population if all sites that are rezoned to accommodate the RHNA are developed to their highest zoned capacity and all residents are new to the City. It is also possible that existing residents that are currently sharing homes may relocate to new units. The increase in mixed-use development could increase employment-generating land uses within the City, thereby inducing direct and indirect population growth in the City.

According to SCAG, the population of the City is projected to increase to 395,800 by 2045, which represents an increase of 20.61 percent from the 2020 population of 328,155. The potential increase in population by adding 31,564 new housing units (103,530 persons) would result in a population increase that would be greater than the SCAG 2045 population projection of 67,645 additional residents. Implementation of the Project could also result in additional housing and population beyond what is currently planned for in the existing GP 2025, which anticipates a maximum build-out of 128,170 DUs and maximum population of 384,510 persons over existing conditions. As stated in Section 3.9, *Population and Housing*, no mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

By law, the City is required to adopt "a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the county" (California Government Code Section 65300). On a regular basis (now every 8 years), SCAG prepares the RHNA and adopts the associated Regional Housing Needs Plan that establishes the share of projected future housing growth that each jurisdiction is expected to accommodate in its general plan. The Housing Element cycle covering the 2013–2021 period included an RHNA obligation of 8,283 units, of which only a portion were built during the last 8 years. The City's current Housing Element was adopted in 2017 and runs through 2021. This update cycle comes when California faces a major statewide housing shortage that is affecting all Californians by raising the price of housing and the cost of construction, and by increasing homelessness. In the 2021–2029 Housing Element cycle (6th cycle), the City's RHNA obligation is a minimum of 18,458 new housing units. Given that 100 percent of potential housing sites will likely not be developed to full potential, the City has provided a buffer of approximately 5,500 DUs (approximately 30 percent over and above the RHNA obligation). Altogether, the City has identified Opportunity Sites with existing and proposed capacity for approximately to 24,000 new homes for the 2021–2029 RHNA cycle. It should be noted that, for the purposes of RHNA, Opportunity Sites are conservatively anticipated to develop up to 75 percent of the maximum capacity established by the Zoning Code, whereas for the analysis presented in this EIR, development up to 100 percent of the maximum is analyzed, thereby accounting for the difference between 24,000 and 31,564 new DUs.

VIII. FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

A. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ALTERNATIVES

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to consider and discuss alternatives to the proposed actions. Subsection (a) states:

- (a) An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a

reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.

Subsection 15126.6(b) states the purpose of the alternatives analysis:

- (b) Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.

In subsection 15126.6(c), the State CEQA Guidelines describe the selection process for a range of reasonable alternatives:

- (c) The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the Project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

The range of alternatives required is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed Project. Alternatives are limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project. "Feasible" means "capable of being accomplished in a reasonable period of time taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors" (State CEQA Guidelines § 15364). The concept of feasibility also encompasses whether a particular alternative promotes the Project's underlying goals and objectives, and whether an alternative is impractical or undesirable from a policy standpoint. (See *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417; *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 (CNPS).)

The issue of alternatives feasibility arises twice in the CEQA process: once when the EIR is prepared; and again when CEQA findings are adopted. When assessing feasibility in an EIR, the EIR preparer evaluates whether an alternative is "potentially" feasible. Potentially feasible alternatives are suggestions by the EIR preparers that may or may not be adopted by lead agency decision makers. When CEQA findings are made, the lead agency decision making body independently evaluates whether the alternatives are actually feasible based on all the evidence in the record, including whether an alternative is impractical or undesirable from a policy standpoint. (See *CNPS*, supra, 177 Cal.App.4th at p. 999.)

If a significant impact can be avoided or substantially lessened (i.e., mitigated to a less-than-significant level) by adoption of mitigation measures, lead agency findings need not focus on the feasibility of alternatives to reduce that impact. (See *Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521.) Nevertheless, Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR and these Findings of Fact do consider the effectiveness of the potentially feasible alternatives set forth in the EIR to substantially reduce some or all of the Project's significant impacts.

B. SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES AND OBJECTIVES

The State CEQA Guidelines (§15126.6 et. seq.) require that a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project be evaluated, provided they would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project. The State CEQA Guidelines further require the analysis of the “No Project” Alternative, wherein the Project would not be approved and implemented. Several project alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected for infeasibility or for failure to lessen environmental effects.

The proposed alternatives to the Project were selected for review in the EIR because of their potential to avoid or substantially lessen certain Project impacts, or because they were required under the State CEQA Guidelines (i.e., the No Project Alternative). The Project and alternatives are described in more detail in the Final EIR and appendices thereto for the Project.

The four alternatives considered for the Project are:

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative, consists of retaining the current GP 2025, including the 2014–2021 Housing Element, the previous Public Safety Element, and the various subsidiary plans (e.g., seven Specific Plans and Zoning Code) unchanged and not including additional Environmental Justice Policies. No changes to existing zoning or allowed development on identified Opportunity Sites would occur.

Alternative 2: Dispersed Growth Alternative, would propose the same population growth and nonresidential development proposed at Opportunity Sites as the Project, with housing development spread more widely across almost all Opportunity Sites, generally at lower densities, resulting in less intensive but more widespread land use changes.

Alternative 3: Focused Growth Alternative, would propose the same population growth and nonresidential development proposed at Opportunity Sites, with housing development limited to strategic locations with superior access to transportation, employment, services, and amenities, generally at higher densities and more intensive land use changes.

Alternative 4: Limited Opportunity Sites Alternative (2020–2045 RTP/SCS Consistency Alternative), would involve selection of a reduced number of the identified Opportunity Sites on which to locate future housing development, focused on meeting but not exceeding the RHNA obligation of 18,458 RHNA units.

Both the Project and Alternative 3 (Focused Growth Alternative) were determined to be environmentally superior. The Focused Growth Alternative would result in more focused growth in the City and would meet the Project objectives including meeting the City’s RHNA goal of approximately 24,000 units. Even though the No Project Alternative would result in less development and facilitate less growth pursuant to GP 2025 than the Project, it would increase significant environmental impacts for land use and planning and transportation, whereas the Focused Growth Alternative would reduce those impacts. However, Alternative 3 could concentrate all opportunity sites within transportation corridors and would limit the ability to avoid sites subject to higher pollution and noise; furthermore, limiting the diversity of neighborhoods and areas available to low-income residents limits the positive economic, educational, and health opportunities, and therefore outcomes; especially for children. As such, the Project is determined to be environmental superior to this alternative.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b) requires that a project description contain a statement of objectives including the underlying purpose of the project. The objectives of the Project include:

- Plan for a maximum allowable development under the Project (31,564 units) to meet the City’s minimum RHNA obligation (18,458 units with a 30 percent No Net Loss buffer for approximately 24,000 units) across all wards.

- Affirmatively further fair housing and identify potential environmental justice and social equity issues to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families—particularly long-term outcomes for children.
- Ensure affordable housing is added across the City and not concentrated in areas with lower access to amenities or near sources of pollution.
- Add a variety of housing opportunities that will make Riverside a more accessible and resilient community.
- Locate new housing in areas readily accessible to services, parks and other amenities, transit, jobs, and activity centers.
- Identify vacant or under-developed sites, meaning sites with substantial unused land or development potential.
- Limit or prevent housing development in areas with development constraints, such as agricultural and conservation lands, airport influence areas, and, to the extent feasible, fire and flood hazard zones.
- Address the public safety and public health needs and concerns of residents, businesses, institutions, and visitors, and set forth a proactive and coordinated program of protection for all foreseeable natural and human-caused hazards.
- Reduce the potential adverse impacts of housing near inconsistent land uses, along major corridors, or near similar uses.

C. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

The State CEQA Guidelines state that the EIR needs to examine in detail only the alternatives the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project. Furthermore, the EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Among the factors used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in the EIR are: failure to meet most of the basic project objectives; technical, legal, or economic infeasibility; and inability to avoid or lessen the significant environmental effects of the Project (State CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(c)).

Alternatives considered but rejected for this Project include various scenarios that would change the scope of certain parts of the Project. These included alternative ways to meet the RHNA obligation either through an alternative location; different versions of the Opportunity Sites; maintaining the City's historical development patterns; and removal of sites that would require rezoning.

State law requires the City to adopt a long-range, comprehensive general plan. The City is authorized to adopt Specific Plans that are consistent with the general plan. The Project consists of an update of the City's Housing Element and Public Safety Element of GP 2025 and the addition of Environmental Justice Policies. Consideration of an alternative location for the general plan is not feasible because the general plan must address the lands within the City limits and any adjoining land that is of planning interest to the City. As such, the Alternative Locations Alternative was considered but rejected from further consideration.

Throughout development of the Project, multiple iterations of Opportunity Site configurations resulted in different totals of housing units and nonresidential development with the same intent of meeting the City's obligation to provide housing opportunities for all income levels pursuant to Housing Element law and the City's regional housing share. These early drafts were instrumental in the development of what ultimately became the Project evaluated in this Draft EIR, but these early versions were not selected as the Project. Some of these RHNA scenarios included numbers that exceeded the RHNA obligation (including up to 50,000 units). Other

RHNA scenarios placed some housing Opportunity Sites in less densely populated areas, farther away from existing infrastructure, services, and transit, which could lead to increased costs for housing and result in greater impacts on air quality, GHG, transportation, and other factors supporting sustainable development. As the Project would meet the RHNA obligation and the Project objectives, all other early drafts of the Opportunity Sites were considered but rejected for further consideration.

The Historical Development Pattern Alternative would allow for housing units based on the historical development pattern of the City. The City approved 2,970 housing units between 2010 and 2020. This averages to 297 DUs per year during this period. If the City were to proceed with development of housing as in the past decade, its RHNA obligation would not be met and would not be in compliance with state law. Therefore, this alternative would not achieve the Project objectives and would be infeasible from a legal perspective, and was rejected for further consideration.

Including Opportunity Sites that do not require rezoning would not meet the RHNA obligation, as adequate sites for only 7,333 units have been identified that would not require rezoning. As this number is less than the RHNA obligation of 18,458 units and would not meet the City's objectives to meet its RHNA obligation and provide a variety of new housing opportunities throughout the City, the No Rezoning Alternative was considered but rejected from further consideration.

D. ALTERNATIVES CARRIED FORWARD FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

CEQA generally requires analysis of a No Project Alternative (i.e., the environmental impacts of continuing existing conditions). As such, the No Project Alternative included what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. Additional build alternatives were considered including Alternative 2—Dispersed Growth Alternative, Alternative 3—Focused Growth Alternative, and Alternative 4—Limited Opportunity Sites Alternative, which vary by density proposed or housing types or a combination of these factors. Descriptions, summary of impacts, relationship to the objectives, and findings are provided for each of the alternatives considered in the EIR, as described below. Table 1 provides a review of the relationship to the Project objectives for the Project and the alternatives.

Table 1. Relationship to the Project Objectives for the Project and Its Alternatives

Project Objective	Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Dispersed Growth Alternative	Alternative 3 Focused Growth Alternative	Alternative 4 Limited Opportunity Sites Alternative
Plan for maximum allowable development under the Project (31,564 units) to meet City's minimum RHNA obligation (18,458 units with 30% No Net Loss buffer for 24,000 units) across all wards	Meets objective. Project plans for maximum allowable development of up to 31,564 DUs to meet the RHNA obligation across all wards.	Does not meet objective. Alternative would not allow or facilitate development of up to 31,564 DUs to meet the RHNA obligation across all wards.	Meets objective. Alternative plans for maximum allowable development of up to 31,564 DUs to meet the RHNA obligation across all wards.	Partially meets objective. Alternative plans for maximum allowable development of up to 31,564 DUs to meet the RHNA obligation but not across all wards with development limited to transit corridors only.	Does not meet objective. Alternative would facilitate up to 18,458 DUs across all wards to meet the minimum RHNA obligation but with no buffer to allow maximum allowable development of up to 31,564 DUs.

Project Objective	Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Dispersed Growth Alternative	Alternative 3 Focused Growth Alternative	Alternative 4 Limited Opportunity Sites Alternative
Affirmatively further fair housing and identify EJ and social equity issues to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families, particularly long-term outcomes for children	Meets objective. Project plans to affirmatively further fair housing, identifying EJ and equity issues and supports positive social and health outcomes for low-income families.	Does not meet objective. Alternative would not plan to affirmatively further fair housing, identify EJ and equity issues or support positive social and health outcomes for low-income families.	Meets objective. Alternative plans to affirmatively further fair housing, identifying EJ and equity issues and supports positive social and health outcomes for low-income families.	Partially meets objective. Alternative plans to affirmatively further fair housing, but concentrating all opportunity sites within transportation corridors would limit the ability to avoid sites subject to higher pollution and noise; furthermore, limiting the diversity of neighborhoods and areas available to low-income residents limits the positive economic, educational, and health opportunities, and therefore the outcomes, especially to the children.	Meets objective. Alternative plans to affirmatively further fair housing, identifying EJ and equity issues and supports positive social and health outcomes for low-income families.
Ensure affordable housing is added across the City and not concentrated in areas with lower access to amenities or near sources of pollution	Meets objective. Project plans to equitably distribute housing across the City and not concentrated in areas with lower access to amenities or near sources of pollution.	Does not meet objective. Alternative does not equitably distribute housing across the City or consider housing in areas with access to amenities or away from sources of pollution.	Partially meets objective. Alternative plans to equitably distribute housing across the City and not concentrated in areas near sources of pollution. Housing may be in areas with lower access to amenities.	Does not meet objective. Alternative does not equitably distribute housing across the City and concentrates housing in areas near transportation corridors.	Meets objective. Alternative plans to equitably distribute housing across the City and not concentrated in areas with lower access to amenities or near sources of pollution.
Add a variety of housing opportunities that will make Riverside a more accessible and resilient community	Meets objective. Project plans to add a variety of housing to make Riverside more accessible and resilient.	Does not meet objective. Alternative would not plan for a variety of housing to make Riverside more accessible and resilient.	Partially meets objective. Alternative plans to add a variety of housing to make Riverside more accessible and resilient, although housing would be less intensive.	Partially meets objective. Alternative plans to add only higher density housing to make Riverside more accessible and resilient, and less variety of housing (single-family) would be planned.	Partially meets objective. Alternative plans to add a variety of housing to make Riverside more accessible and resilient, although less housing would be proposed.

Project Objective	Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Dispersed Growth Alternative	Alternative 3 Focused Growth Alternative	Alternative 4 Limited Opportunity Sites Alternative
Locate new housing in areas readily accessible to services, parks and other amenities, transit, jobs, and activity centers	Meets objective. Project plans to locate new housing in areas with services and amenities, and near transit, job and activity centers.	Does not meet objective. Alternative does not plan to locate new housing in areas with services and amenities, and near transit, job and activity centers.	Partially meets objective. Alternative plans to locate new housing, although in other areas of the City that may not have as good of access to services and amenities, or near transit, job and activity centers.	Partially meets objective. Alternative plans to locate new housing in areas with services and amenities, and near transit, job and activity centers, although new recreational facilities may be needed in higher-density locations.	Meets objective. Alternative plans to locate new housing in areas with services and amenities, and near transit, job and activity centers.
Identify vacant or under-developed sites, meaning sites with substantial unused land or development potential	Meets objective. Project identified vacant and underutilized sites with development potential for new housing opportunities.	Does not meet objective. Alternative did not identify vacant and underutilized sites with development potential for new housing opportunities.	Partially meets objective. Alternative identified vacant and underutilized sites with development potential for new housing opportunities. Note that more sites than the Project would need to be identified.	Partially meets objective. Alternative identified some vacant and underutilized sites for new housing, however with less development potential as more vacant and underdeveloped sites would need to be identified in transit corridor areas.	Meets objective. Alternative identified vacant and underutilized sites with development potential for new housing opportunities. Note that fewer sites than the Project would need to be identified.
Limit or prevent housing in areas with development constraints, such as agricultural and conservation lands, airport influence areas, and, to the extent feasible, fire and flood hazard zones	Meets objective. Project would limit or prevent development with development constraints.	Meets objective. Alternative would limit development with development constraints as no new development would be planned in any constraints areas.	Partially meets objective. Alternative would limit or prevent development with development constraints. Note that more sites than the Project could be developed in constraint areas.	Meets objective. Alternative would limit or prevent development with development constraints.	Meets objective. Alternative would limit or prevent development with development constraints.

Project Objective	Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Dispersed Growth Alternative	Alternative 3 Focused Growth Alternative	Alternative 4 Limited Opportunity Sites Alternative
Address the public safety and public health needs and concerns of residents, businesses, institutions, and visitors, and set forth a proactive and coordinated program of protection for all foreseeable natural and human-caused hazards	Meets objective. Project addresses the safety and health needs of the community with a program of protection for natural and human-caused hazards with implementation of the Public Safety Element.	Does not meet objective. Alternative does not address the safety and health needs of the community, and no program of protection for natural and human-caused hazards or implementation of the Public Safety Element would occur.	Meets objective. Alternative addresses the safety and health needs of the community with a program of protection for natural and human-caused hazards with implementation of the Public Safety Element.	Meets objective. Alternative addresses the safety and health needs of the community with a program of protection for natural and human-caused hazards with implementation of the Public Safety Element.	Meets objective. Alternative addresses the safety and health needs of the community with a program of protection for natural and human-caused hazards with implementation of the Public Safety Element.
Reduce the potential adverse impacts of housing near inconsistent land uses, along major corridors, or near similar uses	Meets objective. Project reduces the potential adverse impacts of locating housing near inconsistent uses.	Meets objective. Alternative would limit housing near inconsistent uses as no new development would be planned.	Partially meets objective. Alternative could reduce potential adverse impacts of locating housing near inconsistent uses like pollution sources, however more sites than the Project could develop with some inconsistently to policies for housing near transit sources.	Partially meets objective. Alternative creates some consistency with policies locating housing near transit and job centers, although places high-density housing in transportation corridors, which can provide more difficult challenges to avoid noise and pollution impacts; and does not reduce all potential adverse impacts.	Partially meets objective. Alternative could reduce the potential adverse impacts of locating housing near inconsistent uses like pollution sources, however fewer sites than the Project could develop with some inconsistently to policies for more housing near transit sources.
Project Objectives Fully Met?	9	2	3	2	6
Project Objectives Partially Met?	0	0	6	6	2
Project Objectives Not Met?	0	7	0	1	1

1. Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Description

According to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e), the No Project Alternative must include the assumption that conditions at the time of the NOP (i.e., baseline environmental conditions) would not be changed, because the Project would not be implemented. As GP 2025 and applicable Specific Plans already allow for additional development to occur and to continue to occur according to historical development trends in the City, it is not reasonable to assume that additional development would not occur without the Project. As such, the analysis of the No Project Alternative focuses on development in accordance with GP 2025 and applicable Specific Plans already adopted for the City.

Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, consists of retaining the current GP 2025, including the 2014–2021 Housing Element, the previous Public Safety Element, and the various subsidiary plans (e.g., seven Specific Plans and Zoning Code) unchanged and not including additional Environmental Justice Policies. No changes to existing zoning or allowed development on identified Opportunity Sites would occur. The No Project Alternative would not meet the City's RHNA goal of 24,000 units or the Project's objective. Future development would be consistent with the population density and land use intensity set out in the current GP 2025 and its subsidiary land use plans.

Summary of Impacts

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality, GHG, noise, population and housing, and transportation; and cumulative air quality, cultural resources (archaeological resources and human remains), GHG, noise, population and housing, and transportation impacts. For these impact categories, the No Project Alternative would result in no impacts on population and housing and impacts would be significant for the other impact categories. For this Alternative, GP 2025 would not be updated to include new Public Safety Element policies related to a review of updated hazards in the City or include new policies and implementing actions regarding Environmental Justice Policies; as such, the No Project Alternative would result in greater land use impacts than the Project related to conflicts with land use plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. Therefore, the CEQA policy of reducing significant environmental effects to the extent feasible would be satisfied through the adoption of Alternative 1. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would result in fewer impacts in the remaining impact categories analyzed in the EIR.

Relationship to Project Objectives

A detailed review of each of the project objectives for Alternative 1 concluded that Alternative 1 would meet two of the nine Project objectives, and seven Project objectives would not be met (refer to Table 1). While Alternative 1 would reduce the environmental impacts than the Project, the No Project Alternative would not meet all of the nine project objectives set forth by the City, namely to support a variety of new housing throughout the City to meet the City's RHNA obligation, further fair housing and environmental justice and social equity issues, and set forth a proactive and coordinated public safety and public health program. The No Project Alternative would not update the Housing Element and Public Safety Element as required by state law and, furthermore, would not provide the benefit of inclusion of Environmental Justice Policies, also mandated by recent legislation.

Finding: The City Council rejects Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative) as a project alternative on the basis that Alternative 1 does not fulfill all of the project objectives (Draft EIR, pp. 4-4 and 4-30) and the alternative would involve greater land use impacts than the Project (Draft EIR, pp.4-8 and 4-9). CEQA does not require a lead agency to select an alternative which does not meet most of the project objectives (State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6); while the No Project Alternative would reduce the severity of some of the Project's impacts,

it also does not meet seven of the project objectives, and is therefore properly not selected. The purpose of a “No Project” alternative is to allow a comparison of the environmental impacts of approving the Project with the effects of not approving it (State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e)(1)).

2. Alternative 2: Dispersed Growth Alternative

Description

The Dispersed Growth Alternative would be similar to the Project, with the same population growth and nonresidential development proposed at Opportunity Sites (31,564 DUs and 103,530 residents). However, housing development would be spread more widely across almost all Opportunity Sites, generally at lower densities, resulting in less intensive but more widespread land use changes. This alternative would exceed the City’s goal of approximately 24,000 RHNA units and meet the Project objectives. This alternative would involve a RHNA scenario for consideration that would meet the RHNA target through less-intense growth over a larger area. The Dispersed Growth Alternative would include less-intense development, more land affected by zoning changes, less likelihood to provide densities needed for affordable housing, fewer homes to be located near transit and other destinations, less-efficient use of existing infrastructure, and preservation of less industrial and commercial land.

Summary of Impacts

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality, GHG emissions, noise, population and housing, and transportation. Alternative 2 would result in greater impacts on biological resources, cultural and TCRs, and paleontological resources than the Project, as more sites would be affected. Because Alternative 2 would result in same population growth and nonresidential development proposed at Opportunity Sites as the Project, Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts on hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems. Therefore, the adoption of Alternative 2 would not reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality, GHG, noise, population and housing, and transportation to less-than-significant levels, and greater impacts could occur on other impact categories. Overall, Alternative 2 would not reduce any of the Project’s significant impacts. Therefore, Alternative 2 is not considered environmentally superior to the Project.

Relationship to Project Objectives

A detailed review of each of the project objectives for Alternative 2 concluded that Alternative 2 would fully meet three and partially meet six of the nine Project objectives (refer to Table 1). Alternative 2 would be similar to the Project; however, housing development would be spread more widely across almost all Opportunity Sites, generally at lower densities, resulting in less-intensive but more widespread land use changes. This alternative would exceed the City’s goal of 24,000 RHNA units and meet the Project objectives with the same maximum allowable development proposed at Opportunity Sites (31,564 DUs), including benefits like addressing environmental justice, public safety, and public health needs. However, the Dispersed Growth Alternative would partially meet the project objectives related to affordable housing, variety of housing types, accessibility to services and other amenities, vacant or under-developed sites, sites with development constraints, and inconsistent land uses, including the goals and policies of the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS that aim to provide a variety of new housing at various income levels near transit.

Finding: The City Council finds that Alternative 2 would not reduce significant and unavoidable impacts or reduce impacts on the resources areas listed above, compared to the Project, even though Alternative 2 would meet four project objectives but would partially meet five project objectives as future development would occur on more sites. Feasibility may also be determined from the desirability of the measure or alternative from a policy standpoint, as reasonably determined by the City Council. The alternative is determined to be feasible,

similar to the Project, although more sites in the City would require rezoning, amendments to various subsidiary plans, or other land use changes.

The City Council rejects Alternative 2 as a project alternative, because Alternative 2 does not fully meet all the project objectives and would result in greater environmental impacts than the Project requiring more land use changes.

3. Alternative 3: Focused Growth Alternative

Description

The Focused Growth Alternative would be similar to the Project, with the same population growth and nonresidential development proposed at Opportunity Sites (31,564 DUs and 103,530 residents). However, housing development would be limited to strategic locations with superior access to transportation, employment, services, and amenities, generally at higher densities and more intensive land use changes. These areas could include areas of the Downtown Specific Plan, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan, Riverside Marketplace Specific Plan and the University Avenue Specific Plan that are adjacent to transit corridors within the City. This alternative would exceed the City's goal of 24,000 RHNA units. This alternative would involve a RHNA scenario for consideration that would meet the RHNA target through more-intense growth over a more focused area. The Focused Growth Alternative would include higher-intensity development, less land affected by zoning changes, more likelihood to provide densities needed for affordable housing, more homes to be located near transit and other destinations, more efficient use of existing infrastructure, and preservation of more industrial and commercial land.

Summary of Impacts

Development under Alternative 3 would result in reduced impacts on air quality, biological resources, cultural and TCRs, paleontological resources, GHG emissions, population and housing, and transportation. The reduced impacts in these areas are a result of a reduction in the number of sites that would be affected by development. The remaining environmental resource areas (hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, and utilities and service systems) would have similar impacts as under the Project under Alternative 3 development. Recreation impacts would be similar to those of the Project; however, demands on existing recreational facilities would be more concentrated in certain areas of the City and impacts related to the construction of new or expanded facilities could result in somewhat greater construction effects. However, the difference in the severity of impacts between this alternative and the Project would not be substantial.

The significant and unavoidable effects of Alternative 3 are the same for the Project for its impacts on air quality, GHG, noise, population and housing, and transportation. While the reduction in Opportunity Sites would reduce some of the impacts, Alternative 3 would still contribute to a significant and unavoidable impacts on these impact categories and would not reduce the severity of these impacts to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the CEQA policy of reducing significant environmental effects to the extent feasible would not be satisfied through the adoption of Alternative 3.

Relationship to Project Objectives

A detailed review of each of the project objectives for Alternative 3 concluded that Alternative 3 would fully meet two and partially meet six, but would fail to meet one of the nine Project objectives (refer to Table 1). Alternative 3 would be similar to the Project; however, housing development would be limited to strategic locations with superior access to transportation, employment, services, and amenities, generally at higher densities and more intensive land use changes on fewer sites. This Alternative would exceed the City's goal of

24,000 RHNA units with the same maximum allowable development proposed at Opportunity Sites (31,564 DUs), but would not equitably distribute these housing units across all wards in the City. This alternative would include benefits like addressing environmental justice, housing, and public safety, and public health needs and development constraints. However, Alternative 3 would only partially meet the project objectives related to the affordable housing, provision of a variety of housing types located throughout all the wards in the City, locating housing near amenities like recreational facilities, lower development potential of locating vacant or under-developed sites in only transit corridor sites, and inconsistent land uses related to placing high-density housing in areas of high pollution sources like transit corridors that could negatively impact health for low-income families and children disproportionately.

Finding: The City Council finds that Alternative 3 would not fully meet all the project objectives under the Project and does not meet the objective of equitably distributing a variety of housing types to be located throughout all the wards in the City, and does place more housing in areas with high noise and pollution sources like transit corridors that could negatively impact health for low-income families and children disproportionately. Also, even though Alternative 3 would reduce some environmental impacts, Alternative 3 would still result in significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality, GHG, noise, population and housing, and transportation and would have similar impacts in a majority of the resource areas with slightly more impacts to Recreation. The City Council rejects Alternative 3 as a project alternative on the following grounds, which individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) Alternative 3 does not implement the Project objectives and (2) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Feasibility may be determined from the desirability of the measure or alternative from a policy standpoint, as reasonably determined by the City Council. Satisfying fewer project objectives without environmental benefit does not support selecting this alternative. Furthermore, this conflict fails to meet one of the critical project objectives of fairly offering opportunity sites across a variety of neighborhoods. Given that this alternative fails to meet that important project objective, and only partially meets 6 others, the City finds that this alternative is infeasible for relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors, as discussed in the *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* ((2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957) and *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* ((1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401) cases.

4. Alternative 4: Limited Opportunity Sites Alternative (2020–2045 RTP/SCS Consistency Alternative)

Description

The Limited Opportunity Sites Alternative would involve selection of a reduced number of the identified Opportunity Sites on which to locate future housing development, focused on meeting but not exceeding the RHNA obligation of 18,458 RHNA units. This alternative assumes that identified Opportunity Sites are entitled or built by 2029 at a density that equals or exceeds 18,458 RHNA units and a population increase of 60,542 based on a household size of 3.28 persons per DU. This alternative would be consistent with the growth projections in the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS.

The Project would result in a significant population and housing impact because development under the Project would substantially exceed the population and housing projections used in the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS. For the City of Riverside, the population and housing estimates for 2045 include a population of 395,860, housing units numbering 115,100, and employment of 188,700 jobs. Projections for the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS utilize land use designations as approved in the adopted GP 2025. The increase in population that would potentially result by adding 31,564 new housing units (103,530 residents) would result in a population increase that would be greater than the SCAG 2045 population projection of 67,645 new residents. As such, implementation of the Housing Element Update would result in additional housing beyond what is currently anticipated under the existing GP 2025 and SCAG projections. This could result in an additional net increase of 35,885 in City population beyond what is currently anticipated at build-out under the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS. This reduced

Opportunity Sites (2020–2045 RTP/SCS Consistency) alternative represents a less development-intensive alternative to the Project, with fewer impacts related to population increase, which would be consistent with the growth projections in the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS.

Summary of Impacts

Development under Alternative 4 would result in reduced impacts on air quality, biological resources, cultural and TCRs, paleontological resources, GHG emissions, population and housing, noise, population and housing, public services, and utilities and service systems. The reduced impacts in these areas are a result of a reduction in the number of sites that would be affected by development. The remaining environmental resource areas (hazards and hazardous materials, recreation, transportation) would have similar impacts to those of the Project. For land use and planning, the reduction in Opportunity Sites would not as effectively meet the land use objectives of the regional 2020–2045 RTP/SCS goals, including creation of affordable housing, encouragement of land development near transit, and facilitation of infill development. While impacts for this alternative would be similar to those of the Project, this alternative would not as effectively meet the goals of the SCAG 2020–2045 RTP/SCS, which are intended to avoid or minimize environmental effects. Therefore, impacts related to conflicts with plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would be greater for Alternative 4 than those of the Project.

The significant and unavoidable effects of Alternative 4 are the same for the Project for its impacts on air quality, GHG, noise, and transportation and only significant impacts on population and housing are reduced. While the reduction in Opportunity Sites would reduce some of the impacts, Alternative 4 would still contribute to a significant and unavoidable impacts on these impact categories and would not reduce the severity of these impacts to less-than-significant levels except for population and housing. Alternative 4 would also result in greater impacts on land use and planning. Therefore, the CEQA policy of reducing significant environmental effects to the extent feasible would not be satisfied through the adoption of Alternative 4. Therefore, Alternative 4 is not considered environmentally superior to the Project.

Relationship to Project Objectives

A detailed review of each of the project objectives for Alternative 4 concluded that Alternative 4 would meet six and partially meet two of the nine Project objectives, and one Project objective would not be met (refer to Table 1). Alternative 4 would be similar to the Project; however, this Alternative would involve a reduced number of the identified Opportunity Sites on which to locate future housing development, focused on meeting but not exceeding the RHNA obligation of 18,458 RHNA units. This alternative would be consistent with the growth projections in the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS and would meet some, but not all, of the Project objectives. This Alternative would include benefits like addressing environmental justice, public safety, and public health needs. However, Alternative 4 would not meet the objective related to exceeding the RHNA obligation with a 30 percent No Net Loss buffer for approximately 24,000 units, and would partially meet the project objective related to the provision of a variety of housing types.

Finding: The City Council finds that Alternative 4 would not meet the project objective of exceeding the RHNA obligation with a 30 percent No Net Loss buffer for approximately 24,000 units under the Project and only partially meets the objective of the provision of a variety of housing types. The City Council rejects Alternative 4 as a project alternative on the following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) Alternative 4 does not implement the project objectives and (2) Alternative 4 does not avoid all significant environmental impacts. Feasibility may also be determined from the desirability of the measure or alternative from a policy standpoint, as reasonably determined by the City Council. Satisfying fewer project objectives without environmental benefit does not support selecting this alternative. Furthermore, this conflict fails to meet one of the critical project objectives of exceeding the RHNA obligation

with a 30 percent No Net Loss buffer. Given that this alternative fails to meet that important project objective, and only partially meets 2 others, the City finds that this alternative is infeasible for relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors, as discussed in the *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* ((2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957) and *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* ((1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401) cases..

E. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires the identification of the environmentally superior alternative among the options studied. The environmentally superior alternative must be an alternative to the Project that reduces some of the environmental impacts of the Project, regardless of the financial costs associated with that alternative. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative is an informational procedure and the alternative identified as environmentally superior may not be the one that best meets the goals or needs of the proposed Project.

Table 4-1 of the Draft EIR indicates whether each alternative's environmental impact is greater than, reduced, or similar to that of the Project for each of the issue areas studied. Based on the alternatives analysis provided above, both the Project and Alternative 3 (Focused Growth Alternative) would be the environmentally superior alternatives. However, Alternative 3 could concentrate all opportunity sites within transportation corridors and would limit the ability to avoid sites subject to higher pollution and noise; furthermore, limiting the diversity of neighborhoods and areas available to low-income residents limits the positive economic, educational, and health opportunities, and therefore the outcomes, especially to the children. As such, the Project is determined to be environmentally superior to this alternative. Alternative 3 would result in more focused growth in the City and would meet or partially meet the Project objectives including meeting the RHNA goal, although would not meet one objective; specifically, Alternative 3 would not equitably distribute housing units across all wards in the City. Even though the No Project Alternative would result in less development and facilitate less growth pursuant to GP 2025 than the Project, it would increase significant environmental impacts for land use and planning and transportation, whereas the Focused Growth Alternative would reduce those impacts. Furthermore, the No Project Alternative would not fulfill all the objectives of the Project. Similar to the No Project Alternative, Alternative 4 (Limited Opportunity Sites Alternative) would reduce some of the Project's impacts but would also result in somewhat greater impacts on Land Use and Planning. Alternative 4 would not meet all of the Project objectives; specifically, Alternative 4 would not allow the City to plan for a maximum allowable development under the Project (31,564 units) to meet the City's minimum RHNA obligation of 18,458 units with a 30 percent No Net Loss buffer for approximately 24,000 units. Alternative 2 (Dispersed Growth Alternative) would result in more impacts than the Project, as more sites would be affected (Draft EIR, pp. 4-30).

Feasibility may also be determined from the desirability of the measure or alternative from a policy standpoint, as reasonably determined by the City Council. Except for the No Project Alternative, Alternative 2 was determined to be feasible, similar to the Project, but Alternatives 3 and 4 were not. The No Project Alternative would not meet all the nine project objectives set forth by the City, namely to support a variety of new housing throughout the City to meet the City's RHNA obligation, and would not update the Housing Element and Public Safety Element as required by state law and, furthermore, would not provide the benefit of inclusion of Environmental Justice Policies, also mandated by recent legislation. As such, the City Council rejects these alternatives as project alternatives on the following grounds: (1) Alternatives 1 and 4 do not at least partially implement the project objectives, (2) Alternatives 1 through 4 do not fully implement the project objectives, and (3) Alternatives 1 through 4 do not avoid all significant environmental impacts. Alternatives 3 and 4 are infeasible for reasons including not meeting critically important Project Objectives.

IX. FINDINGS REGARDING NO NEED FOR RECIRCULATION

Chapters 9 (Comment Letters) and 10 (Responses to Comments) of the Final EIR includes the comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments. The focus of the responses to comments is on the disposition of significant environmental issues as raised in the comments, as specified by State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(b), as well as to provide clarification regarding environmental issues raised. Any revision to text within Volume II (Draft EIR) and Volume III (Draft EIR Appendices) will be updated in Chapter 11 (Errata to the Draft EIR) to update the Draft EIR after its publication with revisions made for clarification and to provide additional detail.

State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5 provides that recirculation of an EIR is only required in limited circumstances where new or substantially increased significant impacts are identified; where a new feasible mitigation measure or alternative is needed to reduce or avoid significant impacts, but is not adopted; or where the EIR circulated for review was so fundamentally inadequate that environmental review was precluded. However, Section 15088.5 confirms that “recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.” It is for those reasons that recirculation is the exception, not the rule. (*Laurel Heights Improvement Ass’n of S.F. v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.* (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112, 1132.)

Here, the minor revisions shown in the Final EIR merely clarify and amplify the already-adequate discussions and mitigation previously presented in the Draft EIR, and do not identify or demonstrate any new significant impacts or substantially increased environmental impacts. Similarly, no new mitigation measures for new significant impacts or alternatives are necessary because no new significant impacts exist. Therefore, recirculation is not required under State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5.

Specifically as to those clarifications addressing wastewater treatment capacity, the Draft EIR already fully disclosed to the public the Project impacts and mitigation (Draft EIR pp. 3.14-21 and 3.14-22). Those disclosures included clarification regarding the 2008 and 2020 Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facilities Integrated Master Plans and the handling of ongoing increased flows and seasonal fluctuations and states that ample space exists for any additional treatment capacity that may be needed in the future. Accordingly, the Final EIR’s edits identifies that the wastewater collection system conveys wastewater flows to the RWQCP and can be expanded to realize future capacity that may be needed, and the elaborations in the Final EIR are mere clarifications and amplifications of the information and conclusions already presented for public review in the fully-adequate Draft EIR. Moreover, the addition of this clarification does not change the physical description of the Project impacts already set forth in the Draft EIR. Therefore, recirculation is not required under State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5.

Regarding Native American consultation, Section 3.13, Tribal Cultural Resources, was updated with the latest information regarding consultation with the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, and no change to the analysis, impacts or mitigation measures were required.

Accordingly, the textual revisions in the Final EIR regarding wastewater treatment capacity and Native American consultation merely clarify and amplify the already-adequate analysis in the Draft EIR, do not change the Draft EIRs significance conclusions, and do not involve or require any new mitigation measures or alternatives. Therefore, recirculation is not required under State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5.

Consequently, the City Council finds that responses to comments made on the Draft EIR and revisions to the Final EIR merely clarify, amplify or make insignificant modifications to the analysis presented in the document and do not trigger the need to recirculate per State CEQA Guidelines §15088.5(b). Revisions made to the Draft EIR are shown throughout the Final EIR in ~~striketrough~~ and underline text to denote deletions and additions, respectively in Chapter 11, *Errata to the Draft EIR*.

X. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The City of Riverside adopts and makes this statement of overriding considerations concerning the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts to explain why the Project's benefits override and outweigh its unavoidable impacts. In the City's judgment, the Project and its benefits outweigh its potentially significant impacts on air quality, GHG, noise, population and housing, and transportation; and cumulative air quality, cultural resources (archaeological resources and human remains), GHG, noise, population and housing, and transportation impacts. The following statement identifies the specific reasons why, in the City's judgment, the benefits of the Project outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. Any one of these reasons, standing alone, is sufficient to justify approval of the Project, and each and every one of the Project's benefits outweighs each and every one of the potentially significant and unavoidable impacts both individually and collectively. Therefore, even if one or more overriding considerations was no longer supported by substantial evidence, the City would stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient.

The EIR has identified and discussed significant effects that may occur as a result of the Project. As set forth in these CEQA Findings, the City has made a reasonable and good faith effort to eliminate or substantially mitigate the impacts resulting from the Project and has made specific findings on each of the Project's significant impacts and on mitigation measures and alternatives. However, the Project will result in a significant and unavoidable impacts as follows:

1. **Impact AQ-1:** The Project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation.
2. **Impact AQ-2:** The Project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the Project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation.
3. **Impact AQ-3:** The Project could result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The impact would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation.
4. **Impact GHG-1:** The Project would generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation.
5. **Impact GHG-2:** The Project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation.
6. **Impact NOI-1:** The Project would generate temporary or permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards for the City. Implementation of mitigation would reduce this impact, but not to less-than-significant levels. The impact would be significant and unavoidable.
7. **Impact NOI-2:** The Project could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Implementation of mitigation would reduce this impact, but not to less-than-significant levels. The impact would be significant and unavoidable.
8. **Impact POP-1:** The Project would result in substantial unplanned population growth either directly or indirectly. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.
9. **Impact TRA-2:** The Project would conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), as the Project would affect the VMT in the City. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.

In accordance with Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and having reduced the adverse significant environmental effects of the Project to the extent feasible, having considered the entire administrative record on the Project, and having weighed the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable adverse impacts after mitigation, the City hereby finds that the following legal, economic, social, environmental, and other benefits of the Project outweigh its unavoidable adverse impacts and render them acceptable based upon the following considerations. Each benefit set forth below constitutes an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project, independent of the other benefits, despite each and every unavoidable impact, and each of these benefits are supported by the substantial evidence contained in the Draft and Final EIRs, the Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies, and elsewhere in the administrative record.

State and Local Requirements and Processes

- a. The Project would adopt an update of the Housing Element for the 2021–2029 planning period by the October 15, 2021, deadline set by the California Department of Housing and Community Development; (2) adopt a Public Safety Element Update; (3) develop associated Environmental Justice Policies; and (4) update the Zoning Code and Specific Plans to address the requirements of the 6th RHNA cycle.
- b. The Project would implement the Housing Element of the General Plan, including a Guiding Principle, Policies and Action Items, to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing throughout the community.
- c. The Project would comply with state law requirements for regular updates to the Housing Element to ensure relevancy and accuracy, to be approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development before it can be put into effect, to ensure that the City would be eligible for some of the state housing grants and funds it currently receives.
- d. The Project would implement the Public Safety Element of the General Plan, including a Guiding Principle, Policies and Action Items, to provide the City with proactive measures to reduce the risk of hazards and adequately, expediently, and efficiently responds to immediate safety threats.
- e. The Project would comply with State law requirements for the update to the Public Safety Element related to (1) AB 747 for revisions in concert with the Housing Element Update; and (2) SB 1035 for inclusion of new information related to fire and flood hazards and climate adaptation and resiliency strategies.
- f. The Project would integrate and implement Environmental Justice Policies and Action Items into the existing elements of the General Plan (1) to address issues related to public health, social equity and environmental justice; and (2) reduce health risks, promoting civic engagement, and prioritizing the needs of disadvantaged communities in the community.
- g. The Project would comply with California Government Code Section 65302 that requires jurisdictions with environmental justice communities to incorporate environmental justice policies into their general plans and address ways that environmental justice communities are protected from environmental and health hazards when a jurisdiction adopts the general plan or revises two or more elements concurrently.
- h. The Project would develop a predevelopment checklist (environmental development checklist) to support the development review process for applicants proposing development of individual Opportunity Sites that are consistent with the Project.

Project Objectives

- i. The Project would plan for a maximum allowable development under the Project (31,564 units) to meet the City's minimum RHNA obligation (18,458 units with a 30 percent No Net Loss buffer for approximately 24,000 units) across all wards.

- j. The Project would affirmatively further fair housing and identify potential environmental justice and social equity issues to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families—particularly long-term outcomes for children.
- k. The Project would ensure affordable housing is added across the City and not concentrated in areas with lower access to amenities or near sources of pollution.
- l. The Project would add a variety of housing opportunities that will make Riverside a more accessible and resilient community.
- m. The Project would locate new housing in areas readily accessible to services, parks and other amenities, transit, jobs, and activity centers.
- n. The Project would identify vacant or under-developed sites, meaning sites with substantial unused land or development potential.
- o. The Project would limit or prevent housing development in areas with development constraints, such as agricultural and conservation lands, airport influence areas, and, to the extent feasible, fire and flood hazard zones.
- p. The Project would address the public safety and public health needs and concerns of its residents, businesses, institutions, and visitors, and set forth a proactive and coordinated program of protection for all foreseeable natural and human-caused hazards.
- q. The Project would reduce the potential adverse impacts of housing near incompatible land uses, along major corridors, or near similar uses.

XI. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The City finds that a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the Project and hereby adopts the MMRP concurrently with these Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (PRC §21081.6(a)(1)).

CEQA requires that an agency adopt an MMRP that includes mitigation measures prior to approving a project. The MMRP for the Project has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the California PRC and Sections 15091(d) and 15097 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

The purpose of the MMRP is to ensure the implementation, in accordance with CEQA requirements, of the mitigation measures adopted by the City and under its control. The mitigation measures adopted in the Project EIR Findings are listed in Sections III, IV, and V of this document.

The MMRP is bound separately as Chapter 12 of the Final EIR and hereby incorporated by reference.

Chapter 12

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

CEQA requires that a reporting or monitoring program be adopted for the conditions of project approval that are necessary to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (Public Resources Code 21081.6). This mitigation monitoring and reporting program is designed to ensure compliance with adopted mitigation measures during project implementation. For each mitigation measure recommended in the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR), specifications are made herein that identify the action required and the monitoring that must occur. In addition, a responsible agency is identified for verifying compliance with individual conditions of approval contained in this Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Initial	Date	Comments	Verification
Air Quality								
AQ-1: Implement measures to reduce construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions.								
Prior to approval by the City for non-ministerial projects proposed on Opportunity Sites, applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts to the Planning Division for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with SCAQMD methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the City shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans or construction drawings) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City's Building and Safety Division. While specific mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce construction-related emissions would be determined during project-level analysis, potential mitigation could include, but is not limited to:	Applicants to prepare technical assessments evaluating potential construction-related air quality impacts.	Prior to approval of non-ministerial projects.	Once during construction.	Community & Development Department, Building and Safety Division				
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Requiring fugitive-dust control measures that exceed SCAQMD's Rule 403, such as:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Use of nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosionApplying water every 3 hours to active soil-disturbing activitiesTarping and/or maintaining a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materialsUsing construction equipment rated by EPA as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepowerEnsuring that construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standardsLimiting nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than 5 consecutive minutesLimiting onsite vehicle travel speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hourInstalling wheel washers for all exiting trucks or washing all trucks and equipment leaving the project areaUsing Super-Compliant VOC paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible	Implementation of individual mitigation may be required as specified in project-specific technical assessments.	Implementation of individual mitigation during construction.		Project contractor				

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Initial	Date	Compliance Verification
AQ-2: Implement measures to reduce criteria air pollutant emissions during operation.							
Prior to approval by the City for non-ministerial development projects proposed on Opportunity Sites, applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts to the Planning Division for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with SCAQMD methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operations-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the Planning Division shall require incorporation of mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities, to be included as part of the conditions of approval. Possible mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce long-term emissions could include, but are not limited to, the following:	Applicants to prepare technical assessments evaluating potential operations-related air quality impacts.	Prior to approval of non-ministerial projects.	Once during construction.	Community & Economic Development, Building and Safety Division			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with CARB Rule 2845 (13 California Code of Regulations Chapter 10 § 2485)• Providing changing/shower facilities as specified in Section A5.106.4.3 of the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures)• Providing bicycle parking facilities per Section A4.106.9 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of CALGreen• Providing preferential parking spaces for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles per Section A5.106.5.1 of CALGreen (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures)• Encouraging facilities to support electric charging stations per Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) and Section A5.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of CALGreen• Providing appliances shall be Energy Star–certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency (e.g., dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers). Installation of Energy Star–certified or equivalent appliances shall be verified by Building & Safety during plan check• Equipping landscaped common areas with electrical outlets to enable use of electric landscaping equipment to the extent feasible	Implementation of individual mitigation may be required as specified in project-specific technical assessments.	Implementation of individual mitigation during construction.		Applicant/Designer			
AQ-3: Prepare a health risk assessment.							
Prior to approval by the City, applicants for Opportunity Site development that (1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating	Applicants to prepare health risk assessments.	Prior to approval of non-	Once during construction.	Community & Economic			
Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project Final Environmental Impact Report					12-3		September 2021 ICF 660.20

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
diesel-powered transport refrigeration units, and (2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residences, schools, hospitals, or nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit an HRA to the Planning Division for review and approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and SCAQMD. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk and/or noncancer hazard index exceeds the respective thresholds, as established by SCAQMD at the time a project is considered, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms, that are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks are implemented. Best available control technologies for toxics may include, but are not limited to, restricting idling on site or electrifying warehousing docks to reduce DPM or requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. Best available control technologies for toxics identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the project plans.	Implementation of individual mitigation may be required as specified in project-specific health risk assessment.	ministerial projects. Implementation of individual mitigation during construction.		Development, Planning Division		
Biological Resources						
BIO-1: Conduct literature review, habitat assessment, and surveys.						
Preliminary Review: Prior to construction on Opportunity Sites that are vacant or where the potential presence of biological or aquatic resources exists, a consistency review shall be performed to ensure that the project is consistent with the requirements of the WRC MSHCP. For the project-specific WRC MSHCP consistency process, the applicant shall employ a qualified biologist approved by the City to review the future Opportunity Site project. The qualified biologist shall conduct a site-specific literature review, which shall consider, at a minimum, the future development project, site location, GIS information, WRC MSHCP survey areas and requirements, and known sensitive biological resources. The review shall assess the site for special-status plants and/or wildlife, aquatic resources, sensitive natural communities, wildlife corridors or nurseries, or other regulated biological resources covered by the WRC MSHCP and/or pursuant to CEQA, FESA, or CESA that could be affected by the project. In some cases, a literature review would be sufficient for the biologist to make a no impact and/or a less-than-significant impact determination for all six of the thresholds of significance (Section 3.2.4) of biological resources and/or the determination that the project is consistent with the WRC MSHCP. In this case, no further work shall be required, and if deemed necessary by the City, a summary report stating the basis for these findings, identifying each	Applicants shall ensure their projects are consistent with the requirements of the WRC MSHCP. Applicants shall conduct habitat assessment surveys if warrants it. Implementation of individual mitigation may be required as specified in project-specific habitat assessment surveys.	Prior to construction. Prior to construction activities. Implementation of individual mitigation during construction.	Once. Once during construction.	Community & Economic Development, Planning Division Qualified biologist		

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
threshold of significance with a CEQA finding, shall be the only requirement.						
<p>Habitat Assessment Survey: If, during the preliminary review, it is determined that potential biological resources including any species covered under the MSHCP exist on the individual Opportunity Site that could be affected, then a habitat assessment survey shall be required unless a qualified biologist determines that a field review/habitat assessment is not needed. If needed, and/or the project is in a WRC MSHCP designated survey area, this survey shall consist of a site visit conducted by a qualified biologist, where the proposed individual development project and adjacent buffer (as appropriate for the target species relative to the potential project direct and indirect impacts) shall be assessed for WRC MSHCP covered species and habitats: candidate, sensitive, or special-status plants and/or wildlife; aquatic resources; sensitive natural communities; and wildlife corridors or nurseries while identifying and mapping all vegetation communities and land-cover types. If suitable habitat is present for candidate, sensitive, or special-status plants or animals and cannot be avoided, then focused protocol surveys may be required, as determined by the qualified biologist, with appropriate reporting. If aquatic resources are present and cannot be avoided, a jurisdictional delineation may be required. Mitigation shall include an analysis of all the biological resources identified in the thresholds of significance, with a determination made regarding significance for each threshold. Reporting shall include regulatory assessment, impact analyses, and identification and implementation of appropriate measures based on the presence of biological resources.</p> <p>Reduce and Avoid Impacts: If, following the literature review and surveys for Opportunity Sites, it is determined that the site would not directly or indirectly affect any WRC MSHCP covered species or habitats; candidate, sensitive, or special-status plants and/or wildlife; aquatic resources; sensitive natural communities; or wildlife corridors or nurseries, then no further action or WRC MSHCP consistency analysis shall be required. If, however, it is determined that impacts on WRC MSHCP covered species or habitats; candidate, sensitive, or special-status plants and/or wildlife; aquatic resources; sensitive natural communities; or wildlife corridors or nurseries would occur and therefore would be considered significant, then additional mitigation measures as recommended by the qualified biologist and approved by the Planning Division shall be implemented to avoid or reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible.</p>						

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval		Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
						Initial	Date
Cultural Resources							
CUL-1: Conduct a historical resource assessment.							
The individual applicants shall hire a Secretary of the Interior-qualified historic preservation professional to conduct a historical resource assessment if a structure to be affected by a subsequent development project, at the time of application, is not in a previously surveyed area, is not a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, and is at least 50 years old. The assessment shall formally evaluate the potential resource's eligibility for listing to the CRHR, its potential eligibility as a Landmark or Structure of Merit, and its potential eligibility as a Contributor to a Historic District or Neighborhood Conservation Area. If the resource is found eligible for any of those designations, it shall be considered a resource that qualifies as a historical resource under CEQA and is therefore subject to the provisions of the Cultural Resources Ordinance. This includes obtaining the pertinent Certificates of Appropriateness and ensuring that the project plans adhere to the SOI Standards. For resources found ineligible for any of those designations, no additional mitigation would be necessary.		Applicants shall conduct historical resource assessments.	Prior to approval of non-ministerial projects.	Once during construction.	Community & Economic Development, Planning Division		
		Implementation of individual mitigation may be required as specified in project-specific historical resource assessments.	Implementation of individual mitigation during construction.		Qualified historic preservation professional		
CUL-2: Conduct an archaeological study.							
For Opportunity Site development projects that require CEQA analysis (non-ministerial projects), prior to construction, and if it is determined that the development project will involve ground disturbance of some type, the applicant shall conduct an archaeological study. This study will be conducted during project-specific CEQA analyses at Opportunity Sites that have not been studied in such a manner in the previous 5 years. The archaeological study shall follow the guidelines set forth by the City of Riverside Community & Economic Development Department in the document titled Consultant Requirements for Cultural Resources Survey, Studies and Reports Information Sheet (City of Riverside Community & Economic Development Department 2011) or successor document. The cultural resources archaeological recommendations shall be valid for 5 years after the date of the record search. After 5 years, the applicant shall retain an archaeologist who shall acquire an updated record search from the Eastern Information Center and review the cultural resources technical report recommendations.		Applicants shall conduct archaeological studies.	Prior to approval of non-ministerial projects.	Once.	Community & Economic Development, Planning Division		
For proposed development locations where only a record search and/or a site visit have already been conducted prior to this EIR, the project applicant shall retain an archaeologist to:		City to make determinations regarding significance of project-level impacts.	Prior to approval.	Once.	Qualified archaeologist		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Review record search results, site visit results, and any recommendations.Obtain an updated record search from the Eastern Information Center if the record search is older than 5 years.							
Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project Final Environmental Impact Report						12-6	September 2021 ICF 660.20

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review available historic maps, historic aerials, and other archival materials. Prepare a cultural resources memo with existing or updated record search results; a summary of background research of historic maps, aerials, etc.; and potential for historic and prehistoric archaeological resources to be present at the proposed development location. Additionally, the memo shall identify potential impacts and provide recommendations. <p>The City shall review these findings and make a determination regarding the significance of project-level impacts prior to approval of any future development. Should the archaeological study result in the identification of archaeological resources on the proposed development site, or should unanticipated discoveries of previously unknown archaeological resources be made during ground-disturbing activities at an Opportunity Site, Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-3 through MM-CUL-6 would be applicable.</p>						
CUL-3: Avoid archaeological sites through establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs).						
<p>If archaeological resources are identified either through an archaeological study or as unanticipated discoveries during construction, implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-3 would be required. Avoidance is always the preferred method of treatment for archaeological sites. Additionally, should sacred objects or objects of religious importance to Native American tribes be identified, preservation in place avoids conflicts with traditional values of tribes who ascribe meaning to these resources and their locations. Impacts on cultural resources can be avoided through establishing fencing around cultural resources with a buffer and delineating these locations as ESAs. The appropriate buffer size shall be delineated upon consultation with Native American tribes and the City (for prehistoric resources). The City and the consultant archaeologist for individual development projects shall determine appropriate buffers for historical-period (non-Native American) archaeological resources on a case-by-case basis based on the known extent of archaeological sites and the relationship to proposed ground disturbance.</p>	Applicants shall establish ESAs for avoidance if needed during construction.	During construction activities.	As needed.	Community & Economic Development, Planning Division		
				Qualified archaeologist		
CUL-4: Develop and implement an Archaeological Treatment Plan (ATP) for evaluation of newly discovered and/or unevaluated archaeological resources.						
<p>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-4 shall apply as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of an archaeological study conducted under Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-2 are unable to determine the eligibility of newly identified archaeological sites for inclusion to the CRHR and it is determined by the consulting archaeologist that additional study through Phase II testing is required; It is not possible to avoid impacts through the establishment of ESAs; or 	Applicants shall develop an archaeological treatment plan.	Prior to construction.	Once.	Community & Economic Development, Planning Division		
				Qualified archaeologist		
<p>Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project Final Environmental Impact Report</p>						
				12-7	September 2021 ICF 660.20	

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unanticipated archaeological resources are discovered during construction on Opportunity Sites. <p>If it is necessary to properly evaluate such properties in such a manner, an ATP shall be developed that describes methods and procedures for conducting subsurface excavations to determine the vertical and horizontal extents of an archaeological site. The ATP shall define the parameters of archaeological testing at the site and the extent of excavation and analysis of any materials recovered. The ATP shall also include guidelines for treatment and curation of any materials recovered during the testing process. Subsequent to implementation of the ATP, a technical report describing the methods and results of archaeological testing and formal evaluations of the archaeological sites and recommendations for further treatment shall be completed. The ATP shall be approved by the City and should involve consultation and review by Native American tribes consulting on the proposed development project. An ATP shall only be necessary for newly discovered archaeological sites that require additional information to make determinations of eligibility.</p> <p>CUL-5: Implement data recovery for CRHR-eligible sites that cannot be avoided.</p> <p>If archaeological studies identify a cultural resource as being potentially eligible for listing in the CRHR and ESAs cannot be established or project design cannot be altered, resulting in impacts on the site, then a Phase III data recovery program shall be developed, when mutually agreed upon by Native American representatives (for prehistoric or historic-period Native American sites) and the City. The data recovery program shall be outlined in a Data Recovery Treatment Plan that details the procedures and objectives for mitigation of impacts on the archaeological site. The Data Recovery Treatment Plan shall include a research design with testable hypotheses and data requirements necessary to address these hypotheses. Additionally, the Data Recovery Treatment Plan shall identify methods of excavation, analysis, and curation of any archaeological materials recovered. The Data Recovery Treatment Plan shall also identify the treatment of any human remains discovered during data recovery procedures. If the archaeological resource is Native American (prehistoric or historic-period in age), then the City, the applicant, and the archaeologist shall engage in consultation so that Native American representatives can be involved in the development of the data recovery plan.</p> <p>Data recovery shall involve analysis of a representative sample of the materials recovered during excavation. For prehistoric archaeological sites, all excavations should be monitored by a representative from a geographically appropriate Native American group. At the conclusion of the data recovery program, a data recovery technical report shall be completed detailing the results of</p>	Applicants shall be responsible for data recovery of CRHR-eligible sites that cannot be avoided.	Prior to construction.	Once.	Community & Economic Development, Planning Division Qualified Archaeologist		
<p>Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project Final Environmental Impact Report</p>						September 2021 ICF 660.20

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
the excavations and analysis. Curation of recovered archaeological materials shall be conducted per the guidance in the Data Recovery Treatment Plan and with consultation between the City and appropriate Native American tribes. Other forms of mitigation could include additional research with archival sources; landscape studies; designation of open space; public outreach programs; and public education/public displays.						
CUL-6: Retain an on-call archaeologist for monitoring.						
For Opportunity Site development projects that require CEQA analysis, Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-6 shall be implemented when archaeological studies completed under Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-2 determine that a project has a less-than-significant potential for archaeological discoveries. Additionally, upon agreement between Native American representatives (for prehistoric or historic-period Native American sites) and the City for archaeological resources that have not been determined eligible for listing in the CRHR or NRHP that are unavoidable at an Opportunity Site, Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-6 shall be implemented. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide a letter from a qualified archaeologist stating that the applicant has retained their services, and that the archaeologist shall be on call during all grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities in native sediments.	Applicants shall provide verification that a qualified archaeologist has been retained for an on-call basis during grading and ground-disturbance activities.	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit.	Once, then as needed.	Community & Economic Development, Planning Division (verification) Building and Safety Division (issuance of building permits) Native American representatives Applicants Qualified archaeologist		
CUL-7: Conduct archaeological and Native American monitoring.						
If cultural resource studies have identified archaeological resources determined eligible for the CRHR or NRHP that are unavoidable at an Opportunity Site, Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-7 shall be implemented upon agreement among Native American representatives (for prehistoric or historic-period Native American sites). At least 30 days prior to application for a grading permit and before any grading, excavation, and/or ground-disturbing activities take place, the applicant shall retain an SOI Standards-qualified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown archaeological resources. The archaeologist, in consultation with consulting tribes, the applicant, and the City, shall develop an Archaeological Monitoring Plan to address the details, timing, and responsibility of all archaeological and cultural activities that occur on a development site. Details in the plan shall include:	Applicants shall conduct Native American monitoring of appropriate sites.	During construction activities.	As needed.	Community & Economic Development, Planning Division Consulting Tribes Landowners/Applicants Qualified archaeologist and Native American monitors		
1. Project grading and development scheduling:						

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
<p>a. The development of a rotating or simultaneous schedule in coordination with the applicant and the project archaeologist for designated Native American tribal monitors (if resources are prehistoric in age) from the consulting tribes during grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities on the site, including the scheduling, safety requirements, duties, scope of work, and Native American tribal monitors' authority to stop and redirect grading activities in coordination with all project archaeologists</p> <p>b. The protocols and stipulations that the applicant, tribes, and project archaeologist for the individual development project shall follow in the event of inadvertent cultural resource discoveries, including any newly discovered cultural resource deposits that shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation</p> <p>c. Treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains if discovered on a development site</p> <p>d. The scheduling and timing of the Cultural Sensitivity Training</p>						
CUL-8: Employ procedures for treatment and disposition of cultural resources.						
If cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for individual Opportunity Sites, the following procedures shall be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:		Applicants shall employ treatment procedures for unanticipated discoveries.	During construction activities.	As needed.	Community & Economic Development Planning Division	
1. Consulting Tribe(s) Notified: Within 24 hours of discovery, and if the resources are Native American in origin, the consulting tribe(s) shall be notified via email and phone. The applicant shall provide the City evidence of notification to consulting tribes. Consulting tribe(s) shall be allowed access to the discovery in order to assist with the significance evaluation.					Consulting Tribes	
2. Temporary Curation and Storage: During the course of construction, all discovered resources shall be temporarily curated in a secure location on site or at the offices of the project archaeologist. The removal of any artifacts from a development site shall be thoroughly inventoried with tribal monitor oversight of the process.					Landowners/Applicants	
3. Treatment and Final Disposition: The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains, as part of the required mitigation for impacts on cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the City of Riverside Community & Economic Development Department with evidence of same:					Qualified archaeologist and Native American monitors	
a. Accommodate the process for onsite reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future						
Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project Final Environmental Impact Report				12-10	September 2021 ICF 660.20	

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Initial	Date	Compliance Verification Comments
<p>reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloging and basic recordation have been completed.</p> <p>b. Execute a curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore will ensure professional curation and availability to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.</p> <p>c. If more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the subsequent development project and cannot come to a consensus as to the disposition of cultural materials, curate the discovered items at the Western Science Center or Museum of Riverside by default.</p> <p>d. At the completion of grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities on the site, provide to the City a Phase IV Monitoring Report documenting monitoring activities conducted by the project archaeologist and Native American tribal monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts on the known resources on the property; describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled; document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources; provide evidence of the required Cultural Sensitivity Training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grade meeting; and, in a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist. All reports produced shall be submitted to the City, the Eastern Information Center, and consulting tribes.</p>							
CUL-9: Conduct cultural sensitivity training.							
<p>For Opportunity Site development projects where either Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-6 or MM-CUL-7 are implemented, Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-9 shall also be implemented. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the SOI Standards-certified archaeologist and Native American monitors shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the applicant/permit holder's contractors to provide Cultural Sensitivity Training for all construction personnel. This shall include the procedures to be followed during ground disturbance in sensitive areas and protocols that apply in the event unanticipated resources are discovered. Only construction personnel who have received this training can conduct construction and disturbance activities in sensitive areas. A sign-in sheet for attendees of this training shall be included in the Phase IV Monitoring Report.</p>	<p>Applicants shall develop a cultural resources sensitivity training.</p>	<p>During construction activities.</p>	<p>As needed.</p>	<p>Community & Economic Development, Planning Division</p> <p>Qualified archaeologist and Native American monitors</p>			
<p>Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project</p> <p>Final Environmental Impact Report</p>	12-11	September 2021	ICF 660.20				

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
Paleontological Resources						
PAL-1: Conduct paleontological resources investigations						
During the development review process and prior to construction on Opportunity Sites that are located on geologic units with Undetermined, High A, or High B paleontological sensitivity, the project applicant shall conduct paleontological resource investigations consistent with SVP guidelines. This process shall include:	Applicants shall conduct paleontological resources investigations in undetermined or high sensitive areas.	Prior to approval of development projects.	Once.	Community & Economic Development, Planning Division		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Conducting a paleontological records search through the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum to identify previously recorded paleontological localities and the presence of sensitive deposits in the CityReviewing Opportunity Site design and maximum depths and extents of Project ground disturbance componentsReviewing publicly available geotechnical reports for information concerning subsurface deposits and deposit depths across the CityIdentifying the potential for sensitive paleontological deposits underlying the Opportunity Site that project implementation could affectDetermining whether impacts on sensitive deposits, if present, would be significant.				Qualified paleontologist		
If no sensitive deposits are identified or if they are sufficiently deeper than the Opportunity Site excavations and would not be encountered during construction, no further steps shall be required. If sensitive deposits are identified and could be affected by development of the Opportunity Sites, implement Mitigation Measure MM-PAL-2.						
PAL-2: Avoid paleontological resources or conduct monitoring						
The applicant shall redesign the Opportunity Site development to avoid sensitive paleontological resources and deposits that could potentially contain these resources. If avoidance and/or Opportunity Site redesign is infeasible, then paleontological monitoring shall be implemented and shall include the following implementation steps:	Applicants shall conduct paleontological monitoring if resources cannot be avoided.	During construction activities.	As needed.	Community & Economic Development, Planning Division		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist, who shall attend the preconstruction meeting(s) to consult with the grading and excavation contractors or subcontractors concerning excavation schedules, paleontological field techniques, and safety issues. A qualified paleontologist is defined as an individual who (1) has an MS or PhD in paleontology or geology and/or a publication record in peer-reviewed journals; (2) also has demonstrated familiarity with paleontological procedures and techniques; (3) is knowledgeable in the geology and paleontology of the county; (4) has proficiency in recognizing fossils in the				Applicant/Designer		
				Qualified paleontologist		
Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project Final Environmental Impact Report	12-12					September 2021 ICF 660.20

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
<p>field, determining their significance, and collecting vertebrate fossils in the field; and (5) has worked as a paleontological mitigation project supervisor in the county for at least 1 year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A paleontological monitor or a qualified paleontologist shall be on site on a full-time basis during excavation and ground-disturbing activities that occur in any undisturbed deposits below ground surface, to inspect exposures for contained fossils. The paleontological monitor shall work under the direction of the Project's qualified paleontologist. A paleontological monitor is defined as an individual selected by the qualified paleontologist who has experience in the collection and salvage of fossil materials. If fossils that have significance for the scientific record are discovered on a development site, the qualified paleontologist shall recover them and temporarily direct, divert, or halt grading to allow recovery of fossil remains. The qualified paleontologist shall be responsible for the cleaning, repairing, sorting, and cataloging of fossil remains collected during the monitoring and salvage portion of the mitigation program. Prepared fossils, along with copies of all pertinent field notes, photos, and maps, shall be deposited (as a donation) at a scientific institution with permanent paleontological collections, such as the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum. Within 30 days after the completion of excavation and ground-disturbing activities, the qualified paleontologist shall prepare and submit to the City of Riverside Community & Economic Development Department, Planning Division a paleontological resource recovery report that documents the results of the mitigation program. This report shall include discussions of the methods used, stratigraphic section(s) exposed, fossils collected, and significance of recovered fossils. 						
PAL-3: Avoid/minimize impacts on paleontological resources during operation.						
<p>If significant paleontological resources and sensitive deposits with the potential to contain significant paleontological resources are identified within an Opportunity Site area during design/planning (Mitigation Measures MM-PAL-1 and MM-PAL-2), and deposits that are sensitive for significant paleontological resources remain exposed at or near the ground surface or become exposed during project operations, then an avoidance and minimization plan shall be prepared to avoid/minimize potential impacts during operations. This plan may include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Securing sensitive deposits from accessibility through the development of exclusion zones Preparing an operations and maintenance plan to minimize degradation and exposure of sensitive deposits 	<p>Applicants shall avoid or minimize impacts on paleontological resources if identified.</p>	<p>During construction activities.</p>	<p>As needed.</p>	<p>Community & Economic Development, Planning Division</p> <p>Qualified paleontologist</p>		
<p>Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project Final Environmental Impact Report</p>						September 2021 ICF 660.20

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designing and developing interpretive exhibits to provide education and understanding of the importance of avoiding and protecting sensitive deposits and paleontological resources <p>If significant impacts on a newly exposed or existing significant paleontological resource cannot be avoided, then Mitigation Measure MM-PAL-2 shall be implemented.</p>						
Greenhouse Gas Emissions						
GHG-1: Implement diesel emission-reduction measures during construction.						
The applicant and/or contractor associated with future development of Opportunity Sites shall implement the following measures during construction and, where specified below, shall submit reports demonstrating compliance to the Planning Division for its review and approval.	Applicants shall implement measures to reduce diesel emissions and submit reports	During construction activities.	As needed.	Community & Economic Development, Planning Division		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant shall limit all equipment and delivery truck idling times by shutting down equipment when not in use and reducing the maximum idling time to less than 3 minutes. The applicant shall also install clear signage regarding the limitation on idling time at the delivery driveway and loading areas. 	demonstrating compliance for approval.			Applicant/Project contractor		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant shall verify that all construction equipment is maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. Prior to the commencement of construction activities using diesel-powered vehicles or equipment, the applicant shall verify that all vehicles and equipment have been checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to admittance into the delivery driveway and loading areas. The applicant shall submit a report by the certified mechanic of the condition construction-related vehicles and equipment to the Planning Division prior to commencement of their use. 						
GHG-2: Restrict use of natural gas in new development.						
Future development on Opportunity Sites shall utilize electrical lighting and heating to the maximum extent feasible or to the extent required by existing or future regulations. Natural gas appliances are to be avoided to the extent feasible as determined by the availability and capacity of electrical power distribution infrastructure.	Applicants shall design new development to use electrical lighting and heating.	Prior to approval of development projects.	Once	Community & Economic Development, Building and Safety Division		
GHG-3: Implement measures to reduce GHG emissions during operation.						
Prior to discretionary approval by the City for Opportunity Site projects subject to CEQA review (i.e., non-ministerial projects), each applicant shall be required to demonstrate that all feasible Tier 1 and Tier 2 CALGreen	Applicants shall demonstrate that feasible Tier 1 and Tier 2 CALGreen	Prior to approval of non-ministerial projects.	Once	Community & Economic Development,		
Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project Final Environmental Impact Report	12-14					September 2021 ICF 660.20

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Compliance Verification		
				Responsible Agency	Initial	Date
Tier 2 CALGreen voluntary measures (Appendix A4 and Appendix A5 of the 2019 CALGreen) shall be implemented.	voluntary measures are implemented.			Building and Safety Division		
				Applicant/Project contractor		
Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
HAZ-1: Conduct project-level hazardous material site assessment for construction of Opportunity Sites involving soil disturbance at sites listed on hazardous materials database and implement measures.						
For development of Opportunity Sites at or adjacent to hazardous materials sites that are listed on hazardous materials databases (see Section 3.6.2, Environmental Setting), prior to construction activities associated with any Opportunity Site involving ground disturbance, the specific applicant shall be required to retain a professional hazardous materials specialist specializing in hazardous material impact assessment. The professional hazardous materials specialist shall conduct a project-level analysis to verify the presence or absence of hazardous material conditions (including Cortese List sites) in the vicinity of the ground-disturbance area and if there is potential for existing hazardous material conditions to be disturbed or released as a result of construction activities. This assessment shall consist of a search for environment-related information present in publicly accessible databases. The information shall be reviewed to determine if the construction footprint or adjacent properties are the site of (or in the vicinity of) contaminated soil or groundwater that has been left in place. If the professional hazardous materials specialist determines that the site (where ground disturbance is to occur) or hazardous material conditions in the vicinity of the site do not pose a risk, additional steps in this measure would not be required. If the construction footprint or adjacent properties are the site of contaminated soil or groundwater, the professional hazardous materials specialist shall determine the potential risk to construction workers, the public, or the environment from construction activities. The determination of risk would consider, among other factors, regulatory status, the type of project, the type of contaminated property, distance and direction to the project, and appropriate measures. If the hazardous materials specialist concludes that the subsequent project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, then no further action would be required. If a site is considered a risk to construction workers, the public, or the environment, the applicant shall implement measures to reduce risk including one or more of the following:	Applicants shall conduct a hazardous material impact assessment and conduct a records search to verify the presence or absence of hazardous materials. If sites are considered a risk, applicants shall implement measures to reduce hazard risks.	Prior to approval of non-ministerial projects, during construction activities.	Once, then as needed.	Community & Economic Development Professional hazardous materials specialist Project contractor		

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of engineering controls and BMPs during construction to minimize human exposure to potentially contaminated soils during construction. Engineering controls and construction BMPs could include, but are not limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractor employees working on site handling potentially contaminated media shall be certified in the Occupational Health and Safety Administration's 40-hour Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response training. Contractors shall water or mist soil as it is being excavated and stockpiled or loaded onto transport trucks. Contractors shall place any stockpiled soil in areas shielded from prevailing winds or cover stockpiles with staked and/or anchored sheeting. Conducting a soil and/or groundwater sampling program to determine the type and extent of contaminants. The sampling program could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A scope of work for preparation of a Health and Safety Plan that specifies pre-field activity marking of boring locations and obtaining of utility clearance; and field activities, such as identifying appropriate sampling procedures, health and safety measures, chemical testing methods, and quality assurance/quality control procedures Necessary permits for well installation and/or boring advancement A Soil Sampling and Analysis Plan in accordance with the scope of work Laboratory analyses conducted by a state-certified laboratory Disposal processes, including transport by a state-certified hazardous material hauler to a state-certified disposal or recycling facility licensed to accept and treat hazardous waste Implementation of a Soil Management Plan. The purpose of a Soil Management Plan is to provide administrative, procedural, and analytical guidance to expedite and clarify decisions and actions if contaminated soils are encountered. Typically, procedures and protocols are included to ensure that contaminated soil is excavated properly and efficiently, and that unacceptable risks are not posed to human health or the environment from contaminated soils. Additionally, the Soil Management Plan shall contain procedures for handling, stockpiling, screening, and disposing of the excavated soil. The Soil Management Plan is a site-specific technical plan that could be required depending on 						

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval		Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
other screening activities conducted (listed above) and is not included as part of this EIR.						Initial	Date
If dewatering would be necessary in areas where contaminated groundwater exists, then dewatering procedures could be subject to permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. In addition, wastewater profiling shall be conducted to determine proper handling and disposal.							
Noise							
NOI-1: Prepare a focused noise study and implement findings to reduce traffic noise.							
For Opportunity Site projects that would exceed the 60 or 65 dBA CNEL threshold (based on the noise contour maps included in GP 2025), the applicant shall prepare a detailed analysis and implement mitigation to comply with the applicable City standards outlined in GP 2025. This could include but would not be limited to actions such as:		Applicants shall prepare noise studies and implement mitigation to comply with the applicable City standards.	Prior to approval of non-ministerial projects during design.	Once.	Community & Economic Development, Building and Safety Division and Planning Division		
• Installation of soundwalls to break the line of sight from noise sources such as traffic noise]					Applicant/Designer		
• Installation of noise-reducing insulation							
• Installation of windows with sound transmission class (STC) ratings appropriate to reduce exterior-to-interior noise transmission							
• Installation of HVAC systems							
NOI-2: For any development where stationary noise sources may exceed interior or exterior noise standards, prepare a focused noise study and implement findings to reduce HVAC noise.							
The applicant shall design HVAC systems for Opportunity Sites to comply with the applicable City Municipal Code standards. This could include but would not be limited to actions such as:		Applicants shall prepare noise studies to evaluate HVAC noise, and reduce noise through implementation of design features if needed.	Prior to approval of non-ministerial projects during design.	Once.	Community & Economic Development, Building and Safety Division and Planning Division		
• Preparation of a focused noise study to analyze HVAC noise, which shall identify a location for HVAC systems at appropriate distances so as to not exceed a noise level of 55 dBA Leq (exterior) and 45 dBA Leq (interior) between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA Leq (exterior) and 35 dBA Leq (interior) between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. at the closest noise-sensitive land use. Design features that could be used to comply with the relevant threshold could include but are not limited to:					Applicant/Designer		
o Locating HVAC systems far enough from residences so as to allow noise to attenuate to below the relevant standards							
o Installing housings or structural parapets around HVAC systems							
o Installing noise-reducing insulation							
o Installing windows with STC ratings appropriate to reduce exterior-to-interior noise transmission							

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Initial	Date	Compliance Verification Comments
NOI-3: Reduce construction-generated groundborne vibration to extent possible.							
The City of Riverside Community & Economic Development Department, Planning Division shall, to the extent possible, require that heavy construction equipment (representative equipment such as large bulldozers) is not operated within 25 feet of onsite or offsite sensitive receptors (including, but not limited to, single- and multi-family residences, institutional or care facilities, etc.). If construction is anticipated within 25 feet of onsite or offsite sensitive receptors, the City shall require pre- and post-construction surveys to confirm that vibration did not result in damage to surrounding structures. Additionally, the City shall require vibration monitoring at the structure to determine if vibration levels exceed the 0.08 PPV threshold at the structure. Should an exceedance be identified, construction would be halted and additional measures would be implemented in order to reduce vibration levels. These additional measures could include, but are not limited to:	Applicants shall prepare pre- and post-construction surveys and implement measures to reduce groundborne vibration.	Prior to approval of non-ministerial projects. Halt construction if vibration occurs.	Once, then as needed.	Community & Economic Development, Building and Safety Division and Planning Division			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Using smaller or less vibration-intensive equipmentMaximizing the distance from the vibration source				Project contractor			
Transportation							
TRA-1: Implement VMT mitigation options.							
As individual Opportunity Sites are developed, future development projects shall implement all feasible mitigation measures to reduce VMT.	Applicants shall review VMT for Opportunity Sites and then implement all feasible VMT mitigation measure options in moderate and low efficient areas.	Prior to approval of non-ministerial projects.	Once.	City of Riverside Public Works Development			
The amount and type of mitigation needed will vary based on the type and location of projects, as development in some areas of the City will generate VMT that is 15 percent below the existing VMT, some will generate VMT that is 0–15 percent below the City average, and others are in areas with VMT higher than the City average. Figure 3.12-1 shows the VMT per service population for each transportation analysis zone in the City and summarizes these three different efficiency areas of the City.		Implementation of individual mitigation options during design.		Applicant/Designer			
Opportunity Site development projects in very efficient areas (e.g., more than 15 percent below the City average) shown in blue on the figure can be presumed not to have a significant VMT impact and would not need any VMT mitigation due to their location efficiency.							
Opportunity Site development projects in moderately efficient areas (e.g., between 0 percent and 15 percent below the City average) proposed pursuant to the Project shown in yellow on the figure shall incorporate a moderate amount of VMT mitigation. Potential measures for each individual development include, but are not limited to:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Consider incorporating affordable housing into the Opportunity Site project (expected range of effectiveness 0.04–1.20 percent VMT reduction).							
Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project Final Environmental Impact Report							
	12-18					September 2021	ICF 660.20

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connect the Opportunity Site project to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities (expected range of effectiveness 0.25–0.5 percent VMT reduction). Provide bicycle parking (expected range of effectiveness 0.05–0.14 percent VMT reduction). Consider unbundling parking costs (expected range of effectiveness 2.6–13.0 percent VMT reduction). Provide car-sharing, bike sharing, or ride-sharing programs (expected range of effectiveness 0.4–15.0 percent VMT reduction). Provide transit passes (expected range of effectiveness 0.3–20.0 percent VMT reduction).² Increase Opportunity Site project density up to maximum zoning density to the extent feasible (expected range of effectiveness 0.8–30.0 percent VMT reduction). For Opportunity Site projects that are 2 acres or larger, provide publicly accessible shared-mobility zones. <p>Opportunity Site development projects in the least-efficient areas (e.g., higher VMT per service population than the City average) shown in red on the figure shall be subject to the maximum amount of TDM considered feasible in the City. These measures include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify measures for moderately efficient areas. Improve or increase access to transit (expected range of effectiveness 0.5–24.6 percent VMT reduction). Increase access to common goods and services, such as groceries, schools, and daycare (expected range of effectiveness 6.7–20.0 percent VMT reduction). Improve pedestrian or bicycle networks or transit service (expected range of effectiveness 0.02–8.2 percent VMT reduction). For Opportunity Site projects that are 3 acres or larger, provide traffic calming on site in accordance with the Complete Streets Ordinance (expected range of effectiveness 0.25–1.0 percent VMT reduction). Increase connectivity and/or intersection density on the Opportunity Site projects that are 3 or more acres (expected range of effectiveness 3.0–21.3 percent VMT reduction).² <p>The maximum total reduction potential for suburban development from TDM strategies described above is 15 percent (CAPCOA 2010). Recent research indicates that other factors such as building tenants play a substantial role in maximum TDM reduction potential. For the</p>						

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
<p>City, outside of the Downtown core, a maximum TDM reduction potential of between 3 percent and 5 percent is expected.</p> <p>In addition to onsite TDM measures noted above, Opportunity Sites could potentially contribute to future VMT mitigation fee programs, banks, or exchanges. No regional VMT mitigation programs currently exist; however, if a relevant program that provides VMT mitigation is available through the City, the County of Riverside, or other regional entity, development projects could potentially pay into a fee program or purchase mitigation credits to achieve needed VMT mitigation instead of, or in addition to, onsite TDM measures.</p> <p>It should be noted that the California Air Resources Board's Scoping Plan has shown that VMT per person has continued to grow throughout California even though the regional 2020–2045 RTP/SCS predicted that VMT would decrease. The Scoping Plan supports two key observations that are relevant to the findings in this EIR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. VMT is influenced by a variety of factors that are outside of local land use control and are not sensitive enough in regional travel demand forecasting tools, including the price of fuel, income levels, and auto accessibility, among other factors. 2. California has more ability to influence VMT reduction through legislative action (e.g., VMT tax, increase in fuel tax, vehicle registration fees) than the regional agencies or the City of Riverside Community & Economic Development Department, Planning Division does through their regional planning and local land use authority. 						
Tribal Cultural Resources						
TCR-1: Implement tribal cultural resources protocols and measures determined through consultation.						
<p>During project-level CEQA review, when required, of Opportunity Site projects that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR, the City can and should develop project-level protocols and mitigation measures with consulting tribes, consistent with PRC Section 21080.3.2(a), to avoid or reduce impacts on TCRs during construction and operation of future development projects. Individual project proponents shall fund the effort to identify these resources through records searches, survey, consultation, or other means, to develop minimization and avoidance methods where possible and to consult with Native American tribes participating in AB 52 consultation to develop mitigation measures for TCRs that may experience substantial adverse changes.</p> <p>In the absence of any specific mitigation measures developed during AB 52 consultation, the City shall develop standard mitigation measures set forth in PRC Section 21084.3(b).</p> <p>The following are standard mitigation measures for TCRs.</p>	<p>Applicants shall develop protocols and mitigation measures to avoid and reduce TCR impacts, then implement them to avoid or reduce impacts.</p>	<p>During CEQA review. Implementation of individual mitigation during construction activities.</p>	<p>Once then as needed.</p>	<p>Community & Economic Development, Planning Division</p> <p>Applicant/Project contractor</p> <p>Consulting Tribes</p>		
<p>Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project</p> <p>Final Environmental Impact Report</p>						<p>September 2021</p> <p>ICF 660.20</p>

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification	
					Initial	Date
<p>1. Avoid and preserve the resources in place including, but not limited to, planning and constructing to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context, or planning greenspace, parks, or other open space to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.</p> <p>2. Treat the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource Protecting the traditional use of the resource Protecting the confidentiality of the resource Creating permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or using the resources or places Protecting the resource 						
TCR-2: Conduct consultation with City and applicant.						
Prior to grading permit issuance, if there are any changes to project site design and/or proposed grades, the applicant or project sponsor and the City shall contact consulting tribes to provide an electronic copy of the revised plans for review. Additional consultation shall occur among the City, applicant, and consulting tribes to discuss any proposed changes and review any new impacts and/or potential avoidance/preservation of the cultural resources on the individual development sites. The City and the applicant shall make all attempts to avoid and/or preserve in place as many cultural and paleontological resources as possible on the individual development site if the site design and/or proposed grades should be revised. In the event of inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources, work shall temporarily halt until agreements are executed with consulting tribes to provide tribal monitoring for ground-disturbing activities.	Applicant with the City shall conduct Native American consultation. Avoid or preserve in place cultural resources on the individual development sites. Work shall temporarily halt for inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources until agreements are executed.	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit. Halt work during construction activities, as needed.	Once, then as needed.	Community & Economic Development Planning Division		
				Applicant/Project contractor		
				Consulting Tribes		
<p>AB = Assembly Bill, AQMP = air quality management plan, BMP = best management practice, CAP = Economic Prosperity Action Plan and Climate Action Plan, CARB = California Air Resources Board, CESA = California Endangered Species Act, CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level, CRHR = California Register of Historical Resources, dBA = A-weighted decibel, DPM = diesel particulate matter, EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, ESA = Environmentally Sensitive Area, FESA = federal Endangered Species Act, GIS = geographic information systems, HRA = health risk assessment, HVAC = heating, ventilating, and air conditioning, Leq = noise equivalent level, NRHP = National Register of Historic Places, PPV = peak particle velocity, PRC = California Public Resources Code, RMC = Riverside Municipal Code, RTP = Regional Transportation Plan, SCAG = Southern California Association of Governments, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District, SCS = Sustainable Communities Strategy, SIP = State Implementation Plan, SOI = Secretary of the Interior, SVP = Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, TCR = tribal cultural resource, TDM = Transportation Demand Management, VMT = vehicle miles traveled, VOC = volatile organic compound, WRCOG = Western Riverside Council of Governments</p>						
Riverside Housing and Public Safety Element Updates and Environmental Justice Policies Project Final Environmental Impact Report	12-21					September 2021 ICF 660.20