

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

364 C



**FROM:** Redevelopment Agency

**SUBMITTAL DATE:**  
June 15, 2009

**SUBJECT:** French Valley Airport Terminal Parking Lot Project

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** That the Board of Directors:

1. Make the following findings in accordance with Section 33445 of the Health and Safety Code:
  - a. The French Valley Airport Terminal Parking Lot Project will benefit the French Valley Airport Sub-Area of the Desert Communities Redevelopment Project Area;
  - b. There are no other reasonable means of financing the project;
  - c. The project will assist in the elimination of blight within the French Valley Airport Sub-Area of the Desert Communities Redevelopment Project Area by increasing the capacity for parking at the French Valley Airport Terminal, which will relieve traffic congestion at the French Valley Airport Terminal and surrounding communities; and
  - d. The project is consistent with the Redevelopment Implementation Plan;

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** cont page 2

**BACKGROUND:** on page 2

Robert Field  
Executive Director

<b>FINANCIAL DATA</b>	Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$ 0	In Current Year Budget:	Yes
	Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$ 0	Budget Adjustment:	No
	Annual Net County Cost:	\$ 0	For Fiscal Year:	08/09

**COMPANION ITEM ON BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AGENDA:** Yes

<b>SOURCE OF FUNDS:</b> DCPA Redevelopment Capital Improvement Funds	<b>Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Requires 4/5 Vote</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:**

APPROVE

BY:   
Jennifer L. Sargent

**County Executive Office Signature**

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL  
BY: DAVID H. K. HUFF  
DATE: 6/15/09  
Environmental Concurrence

Dept Recomm.:  Consent  Policy  
Per Exec. Ofc.:  Consent  Policy

<b>Prev. Agn. Ref.:</b>	<b>District:</b> 3rd	<b>Agenda Number:</b>
-------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

4.1

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** continued

2. Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Environmental Assessment No. RDA/CEQA 2009-03, based on the findings incorporated in the Initial Study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
3. Approve the French Valley Airport Terminal Parking Lot Project.

**BACKGROUND**

Project Description. The project will include a 44,000 sf parking lot area comprised of up to 90 parking spaces with drought tolerant landscaping and parking lot signage and lighting. Proposed use of redevelopment funds would include architectural design, engineering, construction and inspection costs. There will be no impact to the County's general fund.

Findings. The environmental review for the construction of the proposed project has been completed. Based on the Initial Study findings with mitigation, there will be no significant impact on the environment. Attached is a Summary Report, which is available to the public, detailing facts supporting the redevelopment purposes of the project.

Section §33445 of the Health and Safety Code provides that a redevelopment agency may, with the consent of the legislative body, pay all or part of the cost of the construction of any building, facility, structure or other improvement, which is publicly owned if the above recommended findings are made by the legislative body. The approximate cost of the project is \$730,000. Therefore, Agency staff recommends that the Board of Directors make the recommended findings, approve the plans and specifications, and authorize the bidding for the French Valley Airport Terminal Parking Lot project.

There is a companion item on the Board of Supervisor's Agenda.

# MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**Initial Study Number:** RDA/CEQA-2009-03

**Project Title:** French Valley Airport Parking Lot

**Project Applicant:** Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside

**Telephone:** (951) 955-9514 (Redevelopment Agency)

**Project Location:** Generally located west of and adjacent to the French valley Airport Terminal located on Sparkman way at 37552 Winchester Road, Murrieta, CA 92563

**Project Description:** The proposed project evaluated in this initial study is the following: The construction a new public parking area to include up to 90 additional parking spaces adjacent to the Airport Terminal facility. Parking Lot lighting, Airport Signage and Landscaping will also be part of the development.

---

## FINDING

The Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside has reviewed the above proposed project in accordance with the "Rules for Riverside County Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act", and has determined that an Environmental Impact Report need not be prepared because:

[ ] The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

[X] Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in the Initial Study have been added to the project and are hereby made part of this Negative Declaration.

This determination is based upon an Initial Study. The Initial Study is available for review during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday thru Fridays) at the County of Riverside Economic Development Agency, 1325 Spruce Street, Suite 400, Riverside, CA 92507, Telephone (951) 955-8916; at the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, 4080 Lemon Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Riverside, CA 92501, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00a.m. and 5:00p.m., Telephone (951) 955-1060; and at the Office of the County Clerk and Recorder, 2724 gateway Drive, Riverside, CA 92507, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00a.m. and 4:30p.m., Telephone (951) 486-7000. Information regarding Initial Study RDA/CEQA-2009-03 and the Mitigated Declaration can be obtained by calling Chad Davies at (951) 955-9417.

Prepared By: 

Chad Davies, Senior Development Specialist

Date: 4-13-09

## NOTICE

The public is invited to comment on Mitigated Negative Declaration RDA/CEQA-2009-03 (French Valley Airport Parking lot). A copy of Initial Study RDA/CEQA-2009-03 is located at the location at which you are reading this notice. The appropriateness and adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration will be considered by the

following governing body on the following date in light of the information presented in the Initial Study, the recommendation of Redevelopment Agency staff, and all of the comments received:

**Governing Body:**

- Riverside County Board of Supervisors
- Board of Directors of the Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside

Proposed Adoption Date of the Mitigated Negative Declaration: May 12, 2009

Time: 9:30a.m., or as soon thereafter as possible  
Location: Board of Supervisors Hearing Room  
County Administrative Center

**PLEASE SUBMIT ALL WRITTEN COMMENTS TO THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS:**

Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside  
C/O Chad Davies  
1325 Spruce Street  
Suite 400  
Riverside, CA 92507

**Please Note:** All written comments regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration should be received at the address above by no later than 5:00p.m., on Friday, June 8, 2007 at the Redevelopment Agency. Thereafter, comments can be submitted to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, 4080 Lemon Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, and Riverside, CA 92501 prior to or during the public hearing at 9:30a.m. on March 31, 2009.

Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside  
1325 Spruce Street Suite 400  
Riverside, CA 92507  
Phone: (951) 955-9417 Fax: (951) 955-6686

Summary Report: French Valley Airport Terminal Parking Lot  
(as required by Section 33679 of Health and Safety Code,  
Community Redevelopment Law)

**Project Description:** The French Valley Airport Terminal Parking Lot project will consist of construction of a new parking lot area to include up to 90 additional parking spaces adjacent to the terminal facility. Installation of drought tolerant landscaping, parking lot markings, lighting and traffic signage will also be accomplished. Project construction totals approximately 40,000 square feet. The proposed project will provide up to 90 parking spaces for employees of the airport and the general public. The proposed project will replace the existing parking lot.

**Project Site:** The project site is located at French Valley Airport, 37552 Winchester Road, Murrieta, CA 92563. The project site is approximately one acre in size located west of the Airport Terminal.

**Project Cost:** The estimated cost for the French Valley Airport Terminal Parking Lot is \$724,000. The Redevelopment Agency's contribution will be \$724,000 of the estimated cost.

**Findings:** **The** proposed French Valley Airport Terminal Parking Lot Project will benefit the French Valley Airport Sub-Area of the Desert Communities Redevelopment Project Area;  
**There** are no other reasonable means of financing the project;  
**The** proposed project will improve essential public parking and eliminate physical blighting conditions at the French Valley Airport; and  
**The** project is consistent with the Redevelopment Implementation Plan.

**Purpose:** The new Terminal Parking Lot will replace the existing lot and expand the capacity for the Airport Terminal. The project will improve public parking and remove physical blighted conditions.

**REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE**  
**Initial Study and Environmental Checklist**  
**No. RDA /CEQA 2009-03**  
**for the FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT PARKING LOT**

---

(California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3,  
Sections 15000 – 15387 and Appendices A – K)

1. **Project title:**  
French Valley Airport Parking Lot Project

---
2. **Lead Agency name and address:**  
Riverside County Redevelopment Agency

---

1325 Spruce Street, Riverside, California 92507

---
3. **Contact person and phone number:**  
Chad Davies Ph. 951-955-9417 Fax. 951-955-6686

---
4. **Project location:**  
37552 Winchester Road, Murrieta, California 92563

---

---
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**  
Riverside County Redevelopment Agency

---

1325 Spruce Street, Riverside, California 92507

---
6. **General plan designation:**  
PF (Public Facility)

---
7. **Zoning:**  
M-SC

---
8. **Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)**  
The project consists of construction a new public parking area to include up to 90 additional parking spaces adjacent to the Airport Terminal facility. Parking Lot lighting, Airport Signage and Landscaping will also be provided.  

---

---

---

---
9. **Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:**  
The proposed project is located within the County of Riverside in the City of Murrieta, California. The land uses surrounding French Valley Airport consist of Regional Commercial (RC), Low Density (R5), Business Park (BP) and Manufacturing & Logistics (ML).  

---

---

---

---
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)**  
None

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
For

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <b>AESTHETICS</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of Fact: No scenic vistas or views open to the public will be impacted.

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): Site Visit

II. **AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ISSUES**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Findings of Fact: The project will not convert prime, unique or state-wide impact on land. The site is shown as current developed airport property. No impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): RCIP Figure OS-12 "Agricultural Resources," French Valley Airport Layout Plan.

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

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of Fact: Development of the parking lot would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan. The proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, nor would the project result in a net increase of any criteria for which the region is in a non-attainment status. Therefore, the project is expected to have less than significant impacts related to air quality standards.

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook

IV. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** -- Would the project:

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of Fact: The project site is currently unused land. No impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): Site visit

V. **CULTURAL RESOURCES** .-- Would the project:

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

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique pale ontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of Fact: The project site is currently unused land. No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): Site visit

VI. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ISSUES**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

the disposal of waste water?

Findings of Fact: The site is not within an alquist priolo special study zone or an existing "County Zone". The site is not within 150' of a county "recommended zone". The project site is currently unused land. No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): RCIP Figure 5-1 "Mapping Faulting in Riverside County"; Figure S-2, "Earthquake Fault Study Zones"; "Preliminary Geotechnical Investigations"; Site visit

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.**

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**ISSUES**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Findings of Fact: The project site is currently unused land. No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): French Valley Airport Layout Plan

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. –**

Would the project:

- |   |                          |                                     |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**ISSUES**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Findings of Fact: The project will contribute to the area runoff and will be mitigated as stated.

Mitigation: WQMD and Federal NPDES plan. Mitigation measures will curtail all site runoff per item VIII(e).

Monitoring: On site, SWPPP

Source(s): Work Scope; Riverside County Water Quality Management Plan, September 2004

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING.** - Would the project:

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

Findings of Fact: The project site is currently unused land. No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan 2004

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES.** -- Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**ISSUES**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Findings of Fact: The project site is currently unused land. No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): RCIP Figure MS-5 "Mineral Resources"

**XI. NOISE.** -- Would the project result in:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Findings of Fact: The project site is currently unused land. No impact will occur from its ultimate use as a parking lot.

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): French Valley Airport Master-plan 2004, Noise Studies.

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** -- Would the project:

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

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of Fact: The project site is currently unused land. No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan 2004

### XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of Fact: The project site is currently unused land. No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan 2004

### XIV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of Fact: The project site is currently unused land. No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan 2004

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --** Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact: The project site is currently unused land. No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): French Valley Airport Master Plan 2004

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --**

Would the project:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of Fact: The project site is currently unused land. No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring required

Source(s): French Valley Master Plan 2004

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

**ISSUES**

**Potentially Significant Impact**      **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation**      **Less Than Significant Impact**      **No Impact**

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Findings of Fact:** The proposed project would not result in any environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Implementation of the proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife populations to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The proposed project does not have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

**Mitigation:** SWPPP

**Monitoring:** SWPPP

**Source(s):** Staff review, French Valley Master-plan and CLUP 2004; WQMD and NPDES Plan

**XVIII. EARLIER ANALYSES**

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

- a) Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
- b) Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.