

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



FROM: TLMA - Planning Department

SUBMITTAL DATE:
November 16, 2009

SUBJECT: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 3464 – (Mitigated Negative Declaration) – Applicant: Ramona Duck Club – Engineer/Representative: Overton Kuhn – Reche Canyon / Badlands Area Plan: Open Space: Fifth Supervisorial District: Conservation (OS:C) – Location: Northeasterly of Main Street, southwesterly of Contour Road, and easterly of Main Street – 91.49 Gross Acres – Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R) and Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) – **REQUEST:** The Conditional Use Permit proposes to extend the life of existing operation of a hunting club. The existing development is comprised of 11 RV/Trailer parking spaces, an 8 foot by 12 foot tool shed, and the existing well that serves the property. The proposed improvements that will occur only on the southerly two (2) acres include 8 additional RV parking spaces, two (2) 10 foot by 40 foot storage containers, 20 automobile parking spaces, two (2) 7,500 gallon water storage tanks, a trap and skeet range area, and portable restrooms used only during the 5 month hunting period – APNs: 425-050-025, 423-040-017, and 423-050-008

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

RECEIVE AND FILE The Notice of Decision for the above referenced case acted on by the Planning Commission on October 28, 2009.

The Planning Department recommended Approval; and,
THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED:

ADOPTION of a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 40284**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and,

APPROVAL of **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 3464**, subject to the attached conditions of

Ron Goldman
Planning Director

(CONTINUED ON ATTACHED PAGE)

RG:db
P

REVIEWED BY EXECUTIVE OFFICE

DATE

Tina Grande
Departmental Concurrence

Policy

Consent

Dept Re. Per Exec. Ofc.:

Prev. Agn. Ref.

District: Fifth

Agenda Number:

approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER SEPTEMBER 30, 2009
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER**

- I. **AGENDA ITEM 6.6: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 3464** – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Ramona Duck Club – Engineer/Representative: Overton Kuhn – Fifth Supervisorial District – Reche Canyon / Badlands Area Plan: Open Space: Conservation (OS:C) – Location: Northeastly of Main Street, southwestly of Contour Road, and easterly of Main Street – 91.49 Gross Acres – Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R) and Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) – APN(s): 425-050-025, 423-040-017, and 423-050-008. (Quasi-Judicial)

II. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Conditional Use Permit proposes to extend the life of existing operation of a hunting club. The existing development is comprised of eleven (11) RV/Trailer parking spaces, an 8 foot by 12 foot tool shed, and the existing well that serves the property. The proposed improvements that will occur only on the southerly two (2) acres include eight (8) additional RV parking spaces, two (2) 10 foot by 40 foot storage containers, 20 automobile parking spaces, two (2) 7,500 gallon water storage tanks, a trap and skeet range area, and portable restrooms used only during the five (5) month hunting period.

III. **MEETING SUMMARY**

The following staff presented the subject proposal:
Project Planner, Jeffery Childers, at 951-955-3626 or email jchilder@rctlma.org.

The following spoke in favor of the subject proposal:
Alicen Wong, Applicant's Representative, 550 E. Hospitality Lane, Ste. 300, San Bernardino, California 92509

No one spoke in neutral or in opposition of the subject proposal.

IV. **CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES**

NONE

V. **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

The Planning Commission, by a vote of 5-0, continued the subject proposal October 28, 2009.

VI. **CD**

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Chantell Griffin, Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-3251 or E-mail at cgriffin@rctlma.org.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER OCTOBER 28, 2009
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER**

- I. AGENDA ITEM 7.4: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 3464** – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Ramona Duck Club – Engineer/Representative: Overton Kuhn – Fifth Supervisorial District – Reche Canyon / Badlands Area Plan: Open Space: Conservation (OS:C) – Location: Northeastly of Main Street, southwestly of Contour Road, and easterly of Main Street – 91.49 Gross Acres – Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R) and Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) – APN(s): 425-050-025, 423-040-017, and 423-050-008. (Continued from 9/30/09). (Quasi-Judicial)

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Conditional Use Permit proposes to extend the life of existing operation of a hunting club. The existing development is comprised of eleven (11) RV/Trailer parking spaces, an 8 foot by 12 foot tool shed, and the existing well that serves the property. The proposed improvements that will occur only on the southerly two (2) acres include eight (8) additional RV parking spaces, two (2) 10 foot by 40 foot storage containers, 20 automobile parking spaces, two (2) 7,500 gallon water storage tanks, a trap and skeet range area, and portable restrooms used only during the five (5) month hunting period.

III. MEETING SUMMARY

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner, Jeffery Childers, at 951-955-3626 or email jchilder@rctlma.org.

The following spoke in favor of the subject proposal:

Alicen Wong, Applicant's Representative, 550 E. Hospitality Lane, Ste. 300, San Bernardino, California 92509

The following spoke in opposition of the subject proposal:

Susan Nash, Other Interested Party

Tom Paulek, Other Interested Party

The following gave time to Sue Nash:

Ann Mckibben, Other Interested Party

The following did not wish to speak but would like to be recorded as in opposition of the subject proposal:

George Ruiz, Neighbor

George Hague, Other Interested Party, 26711 Ironwood Ave., Moreno Valley, California 92555

No one spoke in neutral of the subject proposal.

IV. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

NONE

V. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

The Planning Commission, by a vote of 4-1 (Commissioner Petty did not participate), recommended to the Board of Supervisors:

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER OCTOBER 28, 2009
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER**

PLANNING COMMISSION 10/28/09
AGENDA ITEM NO. 7.4 PAGE 2

ADOPTION of a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 40284**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and,

APPROVAL of **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 3464**, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

VI. CD

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Chantell Griffin, Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-3251 or E-mail at cgriffin@rctlma.org.

Agenda Item No.: 7.4
Area Plan: Reche Canyon/Badlands
Zoning District/Area: Hemet/San Jacinto and
Lakeview
Supervisory District: Fifth
Project Planner: Jeffery Childers
Planning Commission: October 28, 2009
Continued from: September 30, 2009

Conditional Use Permit No. 3464
E.A No. 40284
Applicant: Ramona Duck Club
Engineer/Rep.: Overton Kuhn

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

Conditional Use Permit No. 3464 proposes to permit an existing operation of a hunting club. The existing development is comprised of 11 RV/Trailer parking spaces, an 8 foot by 12 foot tool shed, and the existing well that serves the property. The proposed improvements that will occur only on the southerly two (2) acres include 8 additional RV parking spaces, two (2) 10 foot by 40 foot storage containers, 20 automobile parking spaces, two (2) 7,500 gallon water storage tanks, a trap and skeet range area, and portable restrooms used only during the 5 month hunting period.

The project site is located northeasterly of Main Street, southwesterly of Contour Road, and easterly of Main Street.

FURTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

October 14, 2009

The Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project was submitted to the State Clearinghouse for public circulation and comment; however, the State Office of Planning and Research did not post the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration until September 14, 2009, which required the 30-day public review period to be extended past the September 30th Planning Commission date. The project was continued to the October 28th Planning Commission date to allow the required CEQA notification timeline to be completed. As of the writing of this staff report, only one comment letter from the Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley has been received by staff.

FURTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:


June 25, 2008

At the June 25, 2008 Planning Commission hearing and the previous hearing of May 28, 2009, it was determined that the project would require an Initial Study to be completed. In the ensuing year the project has been further studied and the project has been re-advertised. The Initial Study has been completed and a Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the project. Subsequent mitigation measures have been identified based on further analysis and those measures have been included in the Conditions of Approval.

FURTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

May 28, 2008

At the May 28, 2008 Planning Commission hearing, concerns from the public were raised on the potential environmental impacts of the project, the adequacy of filing a Notice of Exemption for the project, and the provision of a detailed project description. Planning staff has consulted with County Counsel and Environmental Programs Department (EPD) staff and has determined that the preparation of an initial study would be appropriate to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the project. Staff is working with the applicant and EPD staff to provide a detailed project description that clearly



differentiates between existing and proposed improvements on the site and a list of the multiple accessory uses on the site as well as list any specific uses not allowed. Due to the modification of the environmental determination as well as the change to the project description, the project will be re-advertised.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Existing Land Use (Ex. #1): | Vacant, Hunting Club |
| 2. Surrounding Land Use (Ex. #1): | Vacant and Agricultural land to the north, east, south, and west |
| 3. Existing Zoning (Ex. #3): | Rural Residential (R-R), Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) |
| 4. Surrounding Zoning (Ex. #3): | Rural Residential (R-R) to the north, west, and south, Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) to the north, east, and south |
| 5. General Plan Land Use(Ex. #5): | Open Space: Conservation (OS-C) |
| 6. Project Data: | Total Acreage: 91.49 Gross Acres
2.0 Acres per this Permit |
| 7. Environmental Concerns: | See attached Environmental Assessment |

RECOMMENDATIONS:

ADOPTION of a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 40284**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and,

APPROVAL of **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 3464**, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The proposed project is in conformance with the Open Space: Conservation (OS-C) Land Use Designation, and with all other elements of the Riverside County General Plan.
2. The proposed project is consistent with the existing Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) zoning classification of Ordinance No. 348 that is applicable to the project footprint, and with all other applicable provisions of Ordinance No. 348.
3. The public's health, safety, and general welfare are protected through project design.
4. The proposed project is compatible with the present and future logical development of the area.
5. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
6. The proposed project will not preclude reserve design for the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

FINDINGS: The following findings are in addition to those incorporated in the summary of findings, and in the attached environmental assessment, which is incorporated herein by reference.

1. The project site is designated Open Space: Conservation (OS-C) on the Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan.
2. The proposed use, a hunting club, is a permitted use in the Open Space: Conservation (OS-C) designation.
3. The project site is surrounded by properties which are designated Open Space: Conservation (OS-C) to the west, south, and east and Open Space: Conservation Habitat (OS-CH) to the north.
4. The existing zoning for the subject site is Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10).
5. The proposed use, a hunting club, is a permitted use, subject to approval of a conditional use permit in the Rural Residential (R-R) and Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) zones.
6. The proposed use, a hunting club, is consistent with the development standards set forth in the Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) zones.
7. The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned Rural Residential (R-R) to the north, west, and south and Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) to the north, east, and south.
8. This project is located within a Criteria Area of the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.
9. The project is located partially within WRCMSHCP cells 1875, 1877, and 1974. The project has been processed through HANS (HANS 1533). HANS 1533 determined that approximately 86 acres is required for conservation dedication to the RCA. In addition, the project site has a conservation easement in process to be recorded with the California Department of Fish and Game which provides for conservation on the project site in addition or in place of the conservation required by WRCMSHCP.
10. Environmental Assessment No. 40657 identified the following potentially significant impacts:
 - a. Biological Resources
 - b. Hydrology/Water Quality
 - c. Geological Resources
 - d. Hazardous Materials

These listed impacts will be fully mitigated by the measures indicated in the environmental assessment, conditions of approval, and attached letters. No other significant impacts were identified.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

1. The project site is not located within:
 - a. A high fire area; or
 - b. An agricultural preserve.
2. The project site is located within:

- a. The boundaries of the San Jacinto Unified School District;
- b. Moreno Valley sphere of influence;
- c. Zone B of Mt. Palomar lighting area;
- d. A 100-year flood plain;
- e. A fault zone; and
- f. The San Jacinto Valley Watershed;


The subject site is currently designated as Assessor's Parcel Number 423-040-017, 423-050-008, 425-050-025.

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\CUP03464\DH-PC-BOS Hearings\PC 9-30-09\CUP03464 - SR 10-28-09.doc

Planner: Jeff Childers
 Date: 6/24/09
 VICINITY MAP

CUP03464
 VICINITY MAP

Supervisor Ashley
 District 5
 Date Drawn: 6/18/09




Effective 6/24/09, Ordinance 7-033, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan. The General Plan is a long-term vision for the County of Riverside. The General Plan provides a framework for the County's future development. The General Plan also provides a framework for the County's future development. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Planning Department offices in... at (951) 853-8277 or visit our website at www.riversidecountyplanning.com.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Assessors
 Bk. Pg. 423-05
 Thomas 749 E4
 Bros. Pg.


Area: Lakeview
 Township/Range: T3SR2W
 Section : 27, 28, 33 & 34






RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Area: Lakeview
Township/Range: T3SR2W
Section: 27, 28, 33 & 34




Assessors
Bk. Pg. 423-05
Thomas
Bros. Pg. 749 E4



Area: Lakeview
Township/Range: T3SR2W
Section : 27, 28, 33 & 34

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT


Assessors
Bk. Pg. 423-05
Thomas
Bros. Pg. 749 E4






RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Area: Lakeview
Township/Range: T3SR2W
Section : 27, 28, 33 & 34



Assessors
Bk.Pg. 423-05
Thomas
Bros. Pg. 749 E4





RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Area: Lakeview
Township/Range: T3SR2W
Section : 27, 28, 33 & 34




Assessors
Bk. Pg. 423-05
Thomas
Bros. Pg. 749 E4

Supervisor Ashley
District 5
Date Drawn: 6/18/09

CUP03464
POLICY AREAS

Planner: Jeff Childers
Date: 6/24/09
Exhibit 8



DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan. The General Plan is a long-range policy document that provides a framework for future development. The General Plan may contain different types of land use than is provided for under existing zoning. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Planning Department offices in Riverside at (951) 955-5200, in Murietta at (951) 600-5170, or in Indio at (760) 863-8777 or www.riversidecountyplanning.com.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Area: Lakeview
Township/Range: T35R2W
Section : 27, 28, 33 & 34

Assessors
Bk. Pg. 423-05
Thomas 749 E4
Bros. Pg. 15,000

SITE PLAN FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT No. 03484

CUP 03484 IS A REQUEST TO PERMIT TRAILERS (RVs) TO OCCUPY A 2-ACRE AREA (THE "PROPERTY") AT THE SOUTH END OF THE LARGER RAMONA DUCK CLUB PROPERTY IN THE MYSTIC LAKE AREA (THE "SITE"), HUNTING ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING SKEET AND TARGET SHOOTING, AND FISHING ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING BASS AND TROUT FISHING, AS A PART OF THIS CLUB. THE CLUB WILL PERMIT TRAILERS (RVs) TO PARK ON THE PROPERTY FOR EXTENDED PERIODS OF TIME IN CONNECTION WITH THE OPERATION OF A HUNT CLUB ON THE SITE. THE PROPOSED TRAILERS (RVs) WILL BE PROVIDED WITH UTILITIES AND MAINTENANCE OF APPROPRIATE WATERWASH HABITAT.

EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS ON THE PROPERTY INCLUDE:

- 1) ELEVEN RV/TRAILER PARKING SPACES (DRIT), EACH WITH AN ADJACENT 6' X 11'-5" CEMENT PATIO, PLUG-IN ELECTRICAL, HOOKUP, AND WATER CONNECTION.
- 2) A PORTABLE 8' X 12' TOOL SHED.
- 3) AN EXISTING WATER-WELL AND
- 4) ONE 8' X 48' GARGO CONTAINER IS PARKED ON THE PROPERTY TO STORE AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS ON THE PROPERTY INCLUDE:

- 1) SEVEN 10' X 40' RV/TRAILER PARKING SPACES (DRIT), EACH WITH AN ADJACENT 8' X 11'-5" CEMENT PATIO, PLUG-IN ELECTRICAL, HOOKUP, AND WATER CONNECTION. EACH RV/TRAILER WILL BE EQUIPPED WITH A SELF-CONTAINED RESTROOM (NO RV-DUMP OR PERMANENT SEPTIC FACILITIES ARE PROPOSED).
- 2) PORTABLE RESTROOMS, TO BE SERVED REGULARLY.
- 3) ONE 15' X 48' GARGO CONTAINER (DRIT) CONTAINING UP TO 100 GALLONS OF WATER ATTACHED TO A WATER CONNECTION. A PERMANENT ELECTRICAL HOOK-UP AND A WATER CONNECTION. A PERMANENT BAR-B-Q MAY BE CONSTRUCTED NEXT TO THE CLUBHOUSE.
- 4) A 12' X 12' AND A 30' X 70' COVERED STORAGE AREAS (OPEN-SIDE).
- 5) ONE ADDITIONAL 8' X 48' GARGO CONTAINER WILL BE PARKED ON THE PROPERTY TO STORE AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS, AND
- 6) TWO 2,500 GALLON WATER TANKS FOR IRRIGATION AND FIRE SUPPRESSION.

OWNER OF RECORD: RAMONA DUCK CLUB
17130 VAN BUREN BLVD., SUITE 106
RIVERSIDE, CA 92504
CONTACT: ALLEN WONG
(909) 723-1811

PREPARED FOR: APPLICANT
RAMONA DUCK CLUB
17130 VAN BUREN BLVD., SUITE 106
RIVERSIDE, CA 92504
CONTACT: ALLEN WONG
(909) 723-1811

PREPARED BY: ACTION SURVEY'S
PRESHAM SAVAGE MOLAN & TUDEN
250 E. HOSPITALITY LAKE, SUITE 300
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408
(909) 723-1811

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 425-050-025, 423-040-017, 423-050-008
PREPARED DATE: DECEMBER 17, 2008


LEGAL DESCRIPTION: PORTIONS OF BLOCKS "A", "C", AND "D" OF THE RAMONA DUCK CLUB PROPERTY, COMPANY'S SUBDIVISION OF THE SAN JACINTO LAKE TRACT AS SHOWN BY MAP ON FILE IN BOOK 8 OF JUDICIAL RECORDS OF SECTION 34, T. 35, R. 2W, S. 31N.

ACREAGE: 2.00 ACRES, GROSS, 1.00 ACRES NET
OF 2.00 ACRES, GROSS
RECREATIONAL VEHICLE SPACES: 18

EXISTING ZONING: A-2-10, HEAVY AGRICULTURE, R-R, RURAL RESIDENTIAL
PROPOSED ZONING: A-2-10, HEAVY AGRICULTURE

EXISTING LAND USE: OS-C, OPEN SPACE CONSERVATION, HABITAT
PROPOSED LAND USE: OS-C, OPEN SPACE CONSERVATION, HABITAT

OS-CH, OPEN SPACE CONSERVATION, HABITAT



- UTILITIES:
- ELECTRIC - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON
 - GAS - N/A
 - WATER - WELL
 - SEWER - PUMP-OUT RESTROOMS
 - TELEPHONE - N/A
 - TELEVISION - N/A

SCHOOL DISTRICT: SAN JACINTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1) SEE SHEET 2 OF 2 FOR COMPLETE BOUNDARY INFORMATION.
2) THE PROJECT IS NOT WITHIN A SPECIFIC PLAN.
3) THE PROJECT IS WITHIN CSA 182.


4) THE LAND IS SUBJECT TO MODERATE LIQUEFACTION WITH A POTENTIAL FOR SUBSIDENCE, AND IS NOT WITHIN A SPECIAL STUDY ZONE.
5) THE LAND IS IN FLOOD ZONE "A" (BASE FLOOD ELEVATIONS DETERMINED PER THE INDEX MAP OF COMMUNITY PANEL, No. 086491405 G.

6) THE LAND IS WITHIN A FEMA MAPPED FLOODWAY.
7) THE OWNER OF RECORD, RAMONA DUCK CLUB, INC., WILL MAINTAIN THE AREAS WITHIN THE 2 ACRE SITE.
8) ALL EXISTING STRUCTURES, FACILITIES AND FENCES ARE TO REMAIN.
9) THERE WILL BE LESS THAN 5,000 SQUARE FEET OF DISTURBED, IMPROVED, AND IMPERVIOUS AREAS PROPOSED.

THE FOLLOWING PRIMARY EXHIBIT CHECKLIST ITEMS ARE NOT APPLICABLE FOR THE REASON INDICATED:

- ITEM 24 - NO EXISTING OR PROPOSED STREETS
- ITEM 28 - NO STREET IMPROVEMENTS ARE PROPOSED
- ITEM 31 - NO DRAINAGE IS PROPOSED
- ITEM 32 - NO GRADING IS PROPOSED
- ITEM 33 - NO SUBSURFACE SEPTIC SEWAGE DISPOSAL PROPOSED
- ITEM 38 - NO GRADING IS PROPOSED
- ITEM 45 - NO DWELLINGS, BUILDINGS OR STRUCTURES PROPOSED
- ITEM 47 - NO PROPOSED STRUCTURES OR PAVED AREAS
- ITEM 49 - NO FLAMMABLE/COMBUSTIBLE LIQUIDS PROPOSED
- ITEM 50 - NO STRUCTURES PROPOSED


ITEM	AREA	% TOTAL
CONCRETE PATIOS	1,872	1.87%
GRAVEL STORAGE AREA	2,244	2.24%
MULTIMATERIAL CARGO CONTAINERS	160	0.16%
RESTROOMS	224	0.22%
UNIMPROVED PARKING SPACES	7,200	7.20%
IMPROVED PARKING SPACE	18,000	18.00%
TRAILER SPACE	18,000	18.00%
TOTAL TEMPORARY USE AREA	27,697	27.69%



TOPOGRAPHY SOURCE:
CURELL, D. YARRA
RIVERSIDE, CA 92504
(951) 881-8888
(951) 881-8881 FAX

N.O. 05-03

San Jacinto Valley



Ramona Duck Club
91 acres / 20 trailers
(CUP 03464)

San Jacinto WA
Expansion 27

Ramona Hunt Club
378 acres / 21 trailers
(CUP 03301)
Mystic Duck Club
224 acres / 15 trailers
(CUP 03375)

San Jacinto WA
Expansion 28

San Jacinto River Aqueduct

Colorado River Aqueduct




San Jacinto River

San Jacinto River





Southern California Coastal and Inland Wetland Project

DFG Projects

-  Match Projects
-  Enhancement
-  Restoration

-  Match Projects
-  Private Restoration

-  10,000-acre San Jacinto Wildlife Area Boundary (as of May 2008)
-  Ramona Duck Club 91 acres / 20 trailers (CUP 03464)




Figure 3
Proposed Conditional Use Permit
The Ramona Duck Club Project

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 40284
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Conditional Use Permit No. 3464
Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department
Address: 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501
Contact Person: Jeffery Childers
Telephone Number: 951-955-3626
Applicant's Name: Ramona Duck Club
Applicant's Address: 11750 Sterling Ave. Suite E, Riverside, CA 92503

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description: **Conditional Use Permit No. 3464** proposes to permit an existing operation of a hunting club. The existing development is comprised of 11 RV/Trailer parking spaces, an 8 foot by 12 foot tool shed, and the existing well that serves the property. The proposed improvements that will occur only on the southerly two (2) acres include 8 additional RV parking spaces, two (2) 10 foot by 40 foot storage containers, 20 automobile parking spaces, two (2) 7,500 gallon water storage tanks, a trap and skeet range area, and portable restrooms used only during the 5 month hunting period.

B. Type of Project: Site Specific ; Countywide ; Community ; Policy .

C. Total Project Area: 2 acres

Residential Acres:	Lots:	Units:	Projected No. of Residents:
Commercial Acres: 2	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Industrial Acres:	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Other: 2 acres of a 91.5 acre parcels			

D. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 425-050-008, 423-040-017, 425-050-025

E. Street References: Northeasterly of Main Street, southwesterly of Contour Road, and easterly of Main Street.

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:
Township 3 South, Range 2 West, Sections 27, 28, 33, 34

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The land use on the site is an existing hunting club. The land uses on surrounding parcels include another Hunt Club to the southwest, and State of California Reserve land to the north and east.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. Land Use: Open Space-Conservation

2. **Circulation:** Adequate circulation facilities exist and are provided for via access easements. The project meets all other applicable circulation policies of the General Plan
 3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** The project is located partially within WRCMSHCP cells 1875, 1877, and 1974. The project has been processed through HANS (HANS 1533). HANS 1533 determined that the entire project site is required for conservation dedication to the RCA.
 4. **Safety:** The project is located within the San Jacinto River floodplain and floodway. The site is located within the 100 year Zone A1 and Panel no. 06065C1455G of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps issued by FEMA. The project proposes no permanent or habitable structures. The project has allowed for sufficient provision of emergency response and the project meets all other applicable Safety Element policies.
 5. **Noise:** Sufficient mitigation against any foreseeable noise sources in the area has been provided for in the design of the project. The proposed project meets all other applicable Noise Element policies
 6. **Housing:** The project does not propose any new housing to be constructed and the proposed project meets all applicable Housing Element policies.
 7. **Air Quality:** The proposed project meets all other applicable Air Quality Element policies.
- B. General Plan Area Plan(s):** Reche Canyon/Badlands
- C. Foundation Component(s):** Open Space
- D. Land Use Designation(s):** Open Space-Conservation (OS-C)
- E. Overlay(s), if any:** N/A
- F. Policy Area(s), if any:** Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy, Zone B (37.29 miles).
- G. Adjacent and Surrounding Area Plan(s), Foundation Component(s), Land Use Designation(s), and Overlay(s) and Policy Area(s), if any:** N/A
- H. Existing Zoning:** Heavy Agriculture (A-2-10) and Rural Residential (R-R)
- I. Proposed Zoning, if any:** N/A
- J. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning:** Rural Residential (R-R) to the north, west, and south, Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) to the north, east, and south.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below (x) would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:


A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED


- 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, described in this document, have been made 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.

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, **NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED** because (a) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible.
- I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An **ADDENDUM** to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.
- I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a **SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.
- I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a **SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required: (1)

Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any the following:(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or,(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.


Signature


Date

Jeffery K. Childers, Urban Regional Planner IV
Printed Name

For Ron Goldman, Planning Director

V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000-21178.1), this Initial Study has been prepared to analyze the proposed project to determine any potential significant impacts upon the environment that would result from construction and implementation of the project. In accordance with California Code of Regulations, Section 15063, this Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the Lead Agency, the County of Riverside, in consultation with other jurisdictional agencies, to determine whether a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report is required for the proposed project. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the decision-makers, affected agencies, and the public of potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
AESTHETICS Would the project				
1. Scenic Resources				
a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	<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 unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-7 "Scenic Highways"

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project is not located adjacent to any highway corridor that has been dedicated as a scenic corridor. Access to the site is provided by Davis Road, a street that is not designated as scenic corridor and is not listed as eligible for consideration as scenic highways, therefore there is no impact.
- b) The proposed project will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features, or obstruct a prominent scenic vista or view open to the public, as these features do not exist on the project site. Additionally, the project is existing and there are no prominent features on the site, therefore there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?				

Source: Applicant Material, GIS database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution)

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact:

- a) According to the Riverside County Land Information System, the site is located approximately 37.29 miles from the Mt. Palomar Observatory and therefore is required to follow the lighting restrictions in accordance with Ordinance No. 655. The following mitigation measures will reduce the impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation: 10. Planning. 45 & 10. Planning 72 – Requires the project to use only approved lighting methods and all lighting shall be hooded and directed so as not to shine on adjacent properties

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be done by the Planning Department and Building and Safety.

3. Other Lighting Issues

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Description

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project will include the aforementioned mitigation measures that once in place will not create a new source of substantial light or glare and will not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. With the mitigations, the impacts will be less than significant.
- b) There are no adjacent residences and the adjacent land uses are Open Space, therefore there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are necessary

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES Would the project

4. Agriculture

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract (Riv. Co. Agricultural Land Conservation Contract Maps)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Involve other changes in the existing environment | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database, and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project is located in area designated as Farmland of Local Importance per the Riverside County General Plan. However, since the project will not include permanent housing or development the project would not convert this property. Additionally, the site is located in area designed as Farmland of Local Importance and is not one of the protected categories mentioned above; therefore the impacts would be less than significant.
- b) No agricultural uses are being conducted at the project site and the project site is not under a Williamson Act contract, therefore the impacts will be less than significant.
- c) The project has no potential to cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned properties (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm"); or involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use as the project site is zoned Heavy Agriculture (A-2-10). The project must comply with all aspects of County Ordinance 625 and shall be required to inform users regarding the adjacent agricultural uses. The impacts would be less than significant.
- d) The proposed project will not involve other changes in the existing environment that will result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

AIR QUALITY Would the project

5. Air Quality Impacts

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 checked="" 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 which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 6-2 (Urbemis 2002 for Windows 8.7.0) and Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project does not violate any ambient air quality standard, contributes substantially to an existing air quality violation, or exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- b) Air quality impacts would occur during site preparation, basically from equipment exhaust. Major sources of fugitive dust are a result of grading and site preparation, however, the site is not proposing significant grading. These short-term construction related impacts will be reduced below a level of significance.
- c) The project will not 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.
- d) Surrounding land uses are open space and agriculture which are not considered a sensitive receptor, therefore, the project is not expected to expose sensitive receptors to project substantial point source emissions.
- e) The proposed project does not include the construction of a sensitive receptor and the project is not located within one mile of a point source emitter, therefore there are no impacts.
- f) During construction, the proposed project includes operations that will have diesel odors associated with equipment and materials. None of these odors are permanent, nor are they normally considered so offensive as to cause sensitive receptors to complain. Both based on the short-term of the emissions and the characteristics of these emissions, no significant odor impacts are forecast to result from implementing the proposed project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project

6. Wildlife & Vegetation

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?

c) 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. Wildlife Service?

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) 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"/>
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Habitat Assessment Report by Brian F. Smith & Associates dated June 5, 2007, HANS01533, GIS database, WRCMSHCP, and On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site does not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Conservation Community Plan and has undergone review by the Environmental Programs Department and the Riverside County Resource Conservation Agency with respect to the HANS determination. The project will not conflict with any state conservation plans as the project will be dedicating a conservation easement over the entire project area to the Regional Conservation Authority for the protection of critical habitat. Once the conservation easement is in place the impacts will be less than significant.
- b) According to the Habitat Assessment Report, no threatened or endangered species were observed on the project site and given the site's existing condition there is a low potential for any MSHCP-listed plant and animal species to occur on-site due to a lack of viable habitat, therefore the impacts are less than significant.
- c) The development of the site will not 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. Wildlife Service as none were located on the project site, the southerly 2 acre portion of the study area as described in the Habitat Assessment date June 5, 2007, therefore the impact is less than significant.
- d) As a condition of approval, the project will be required to follow the requirements of the Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines which includes specific stipulations regarding fencing, brush removal, lighting, grading, noise, drainage, circulation, and any proposed landscaping. Following these guidelines will allow the free movement of native residents and will not impeded the use of any native wildlife nursery sites.
- e) The project as designed will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service as none exists on the project site. The conditions as mentioned above will require protection of any drainage that may

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

occur offsite and will require review prior to any extensive grading, therefore the impacts will be less than significant.

- f) According to the Habitat Assessment, there are no existing water courses on the project site and the development of the site will not have any impact 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.
- g) In accordance with the required conservation easement and the determinations made during the HANS review, no significant biological resource impacts are forecast to occur as a result of implementing the proposed project. No local biological protection policies or ordinances apply to the project site. The project will be required to dedicate conservation easements to the regional conservation agency in order to protect sensitive habitat. (EPD=Environmental Programs Department)

Mitigation: 10. EPD. 1, 20. EPD. 1, 60. EPD 1, 80. EPD 1 all require conformance with the Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines (UWIG) and shall require review and approval from the EPD.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be done by the Riverside Environmental Programs Department, the Regional Conservation Agency, Building and Safety, and the Planning Department.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. Historic Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, and Riverside County Archaeologist

Findings of Fact:

- a) The site does not contain a historical site and the project does not propose demolition of any potential historic resource, therefore there is no impact.
- b) The site does not propose changes of any nature to cause a substantial adverse change to any historical resource, therefore there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

8. Archaeological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, and Riverside County Archaeologist Review

Findings of Fact:

- a) According to the review conducted by the County Archaeologist, no archaeological resources were observed within the project boundaries. Additionally, 10. Planning 42 has been required as part of the project in the event of any archeological discovery; therefore the impacts will be less than significant.
- b) Per the review conducted by the County Archaeologist, no substantial adverse change in the significance of any archaeological resource will result from project implementation.
- c) Although no human remains are anticipated to be located within the project site, the proposal has been conditioned to contact the County Coroner for a determination of the origin and disposition of the remains per 10. Planning 41. This is a standard condition and is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
- d) No religious or sacred uses are known to occur at the project site; therefore, no restrictions of religious or sacred activities can result from project implementation; therefore there are no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

9. Paleontological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?				

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity"

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed project is located within an area designated as having a high potential for the existence of paleontological resources according to the General Plan Paleontological Sensitivity Resources Map; however, impacts that directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature are considered less than significant as the site has been previously disturbed. Also, the applicant will require a paleontologist to be onsite during any ground disturbing activity to monitor for potential resources per 60. Planning 32. This is a standard condition and not considered unique mitigation, therefore the impact will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project

10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?				
b) Be subject to 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, Geologist Comments

Findings of Fact:

- a) According to RCIP, the project is located within the San Jacinto Fault Zone. Per the County Geologists comments and COA 10. Planning 40 and 10. Flood RI 04, the construction of any structure for human occupancy will require a geotechnical investigation and a comprehensive report shall be provided, reviewed, and approved prior to any building permit issuance.
- b) The site is not located in an area know to be subject to rupture as delineated on the State Geologist map or based on any other information. 10. Planning 40 will require a comprehensive report and soils investigation in the event of the construction of any structures for human occupancy.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

11. Liquefaction Potential Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction"

Findings of Fact:

- a) According to the Riverside County General Plan, the project site is located within an area mapped as having active liquefaction. However, the project does not propose any permanent structures and in accordance with 10. Planning 40, any proposal to construct structures for human occupancy will require a detailed geotechnical report to be provided, reviewed, and approved. Additionally, 10. Flood RI 5 states that no building permits are to be issued for this permit and no permanent structures will be allowed. Therefore the impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

12. Ground-shaking Zone

Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk)

Findings of Fact:

- a) According to RCIP, the project is located within the San Jacinto Fault Zone. Per the County Geologists comments and COA 10. Planning 40, any contemplation of the construction of any structure for human occupancy will require a geotechnical investigation and a comprehensive report shall be provided, reviewed, and approved prior to any building permit issuance.

Mitigation: 10. Planning 40 requires further evaluation prior to any request for structures to be built.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be done by the Riverside County Building & Safety department and the Planning Department.

13. Landslide Risk

a) 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, collapse, or rockfall hazards?

Source: On-site Inspection, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope"

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site has been previously graded and the site slopes generally to the north. The geological and seismic hazards evaluation indicates the site is considered to have no significant slope instability or susceptibility to seismically induced landslides and rock falls. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project has no potential to expose the proposed facilities to any landslide, mudslide, or rockfall hazards.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

14. Ground Subsidence

a) 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 ground subsidence?

Source: Riverside County General Plan and GIS information.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

17. Soils

a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

b) 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?

Source: Project Application Materials and On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

- a) The development of the project site will not result in soil erosion during grading and construction because the site has been previously graded and improved. If substantial grading is proposed, a grading plan, Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), and incorporating the proper mitigation measures must be submitted.
- b) The site is located in an area experiencing active subsidence. None of the soils on the site would be considered expansive and the project does not propose any permanent structures and is restricted from constructing permanent structures via 10. Flood RI 4, and there will be no permanent structures for human occupancy therefore the impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

18. Erosion

a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?

b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?

Source: Project Application Materials and On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site does not contain any river channels or lake beds in the developed area and none are in close enough proximity to the project site. County grading standards, best management practices and the WQMP are required to control potential hazards. No substantial grading is proposed and in the event grading is proposed a complete grading and geotechnical report will be required.
- b) Since the site is existing and the proposed improvements do not require substantial grading, there will be no impacts that will increase the potential for erosion either on or off site.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

19. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. 460, Sec. 14.2 & Ord. 484

a) Findings of Fact: The proposed project is not subject to on or off-site wind erosion or blowsand.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

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"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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?

c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?

d) 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) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

e) 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) 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?

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The use of a trap and skeet range has the potential for increased lead deposits from the shooting of lead shot for trap and skeet. The Hunt Club will be required to provide by-laws and other restraining

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

policies to ensure that only non-lead shot, steel or equivalent are used on the trap and skeet area. Per 20. Planning 8, the Club shall provide amended by-laws and any other policy documentation to the Planning Department for review and approval within 90 days of the approval of this project.

b-e) The project will not create a hazard to the public through the use of hazardous material. The project will not store or utilize any hazardous materials that may be released into the environment. The project will not interfere with any emergency plan. The project is not located within one-quarter mile of any existing school and the project is not located on a known hazardous materials site.

Mitigation: Restriction of the use of lead shot in the trap and skeet area by incorporation of restrictions in the by-laws of the Hunt Club, per 20. Planning 8.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be done by the Planning Department and the Building and Safety Department.

21. Airports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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"/>
d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, 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"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a-d) The project is not located in an Airport influence area and will not have any effect on any airport operations.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

22. Hazardous Fire Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) 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"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility," GIS database

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located within a hazardous fire area; therefore, implementation of the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands. No impacts are anticipated; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project

23. Water Quality Impacts

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

c) 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)?

d) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

e) 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?

f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors and odors)?

Source: Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition.

Findings of Fact:

a) The site has been previously graded and does not contain any existing concentrated drainage, existing or proposed and no changes to the existing drainage patterns are permitted per 10. Flood RI 5. Therefore there is no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- b) The project proposes all wastewater to be self contained in the RV/trailers or within the temporary portable restrooms. The use of a trap and skeet range has the potential for increased lead deposits from the shooting of lead shot for trap and skeet. The Hunt Club will be required to provide bylaws and other restraining policies to ensure that only non-lead shot, steel or equivalent are used on the trap and skeet area. Per 20. Planning 08, the Club shall provide amended by-laws and any other policy documentation to the Planning Department for review and approval within 90 days of the approval of this project
- c) The site is served by an existing well and the project does not propose any significant increase in water usage that would cause a lowering of the local groundwater table or local groundwater level, therefore there is no impact.
- d) There is no substantial grading proposed on the project site, therefore there is no impact.
- e-f) The project site is located in the San Jacinto River floodplain and floodway. However no housing or permanent structures are proposed with the project and in accordance with 10. Flood 1&4, no RV/trailer shall be considered a permanent structure and shall not remain for more than 180 days. With the proposed mitigation of the above condition, the projects impacts will be less than significant.
- g) The project will not degrade the water quality, therefore there is no impact.
- h) The project will not propose significant drainage improvement or grading and shall not require a WQMP, therefore there are no impacts.

Mitigation: Condition of Approval 10. Flood 1 and 10. Flood 4, shall restrict the type of RV/trailer and shall restrict the amount of time these trailers can be parked on the site. 20. Planning 08 requires the applicant to provide copies of the amended by-laws requiring the restriction of lead shot in the trap and skeet area.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be done by the Riverside County Building & Safety department and the Planning Department.

24. Floodplains

Degree of Suitability in 100-Year Floodplains. As indicated below, the appropriate Degree of Suitability has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	U - Generally Unsuitable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	R - Restricted <input type="checkbox"/>
a) 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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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 (Dam Inundation Area)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones," Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

- a) The existing site does not contain any concentrated drainage or substantial grading and would not cause the alteration of any watercourse. The site has also been previously graded and will not cause an increase in runoff, therefore there is no impact.
- b) The existing site will not cause a change in absorption rates or an increase in runoff.
- c) The project site is located in the San Jacinto River floodplain and floodway. However, no housing or permanent structures are proposed with the project and in accordance with 10. Flood 1&4, no RV/trailer shall be considered a permanent structure and shall not remain for more than 180 days and all trailers must be mobile and moveable to ensure the safety of the property and the uses of the hunt club. With the proposed mitigation of the above condition, the projects impacts will be less than significant.
- d) The project does not propose any permanent structures and will not seriously impact the surface water in any body of water, therefore there is no impact.

Mitigation: Condition of Approval 10. Flood 1 and 10. Flood 4, shall restrict the type of RV/trailer and shall restrict the amount of time these trailers can be parked on the site.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be done by the Riverside County Building & Safety department and the Planning Department.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
25. Land Use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project proposes to permit an existing operation of a hunting club. The Conditional Use Permit applicant is consistent with the Riverside County General Plan and will not result in a substantial alteration of the planned land use in the area. Therefore with the approval of the Conditional Use permit, the impacts will be less than significant.
- b) The project is not located in a city sphere or adjacent to a city, therefore there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

26. Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site's existing zoning classification is Heavy Agriculture (A-2) and the use is consistent with those requirements based on the temporary nature of the project. Pursuant to 10. Flood 1&3, no RV/trailer shall be allowed on the project site for more than 180 days. Therefore the proposed use is of a temporary nature and the impacts will be less than significant.
- b) The proposed project is compatible with the existing and surrounding zoning classifications as adjacent parcels are zoned Open Space – Conservation (OS-C) and Open Space – Conservation Habitat (OS-CH) to the north, west, south, and east.
- c) The proposed project is compatible with the existing and planned surrounding land uses in the area.
- d) The proposed development is consistent with the Open Space – Conservation (OS-C) and Open Space – Conservation Habitat (OS-CH) land use designations.
- e) The proposed project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community as the project site is vacant and adjacent parcels are vacant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

27. Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				
c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area"

Findings of Fact:

- a) Per RCIP, the project site is located within Mineral Zone MRZ-3; however, no mineral resources have been identified on the project site and there is no historical use of the site or surrounding area for mineral extraction purposes. The project site is also not located in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State.
- b) The development of the proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.
- c) The project site is not located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine.
- d) The project does not propose or is located within existing or abandoned quarries or mines.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

NOISE Would the project result in

Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings

Where indicated below, the appropriate Noise Acceptability Rating(s) has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable

A - Generally Acceptable

B - Conditionally Acceptable

C - Generally Unacceptable

D - Land Use Discouraged

28. Airport Noise

a) 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?

NA A B C D

b) 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?

NA A B C D

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact:

- a) Per the RCIP, the project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport that would expose people working in the project site to excessive noise levels.
- b) The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip that would expose people working in the project site to excessive noise levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

29. Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", GIS database, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located near an active railroad line. No impacts will occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

30. Highway Noise

NA A B C D

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project is not located near an existing Highway and no noise impacts will occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

31. Other Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database

Findings of Fact: No other noise pollution sources are anticipated to impact the project site.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
32. Noise Effects on or by the Project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) 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"/>
b) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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"/>
d) 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"/>

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project is of limited use and will not increase the ambient noise level.
- b) The project involves a hunting club that may involve the periodic discharge of firearms in the act of hunting. However, these actions will be limited and of short duration as to not pose a significant impact.
- c) The project does not propose any uses that will generate noise in excess of those established in the existing General Plan.
- d) There will be no exposure to ground-borne vibration or increased noise levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
33. Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) 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"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) 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"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element

Findings of Fact:

- a) Implementation of the project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing as the site is currently vacant and will, therefore, not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- b) The project will not create any significant demand for housing.
- c) No persons live on the project site, so no displacement of people can result from project implementation.
- d) The project site is not located within a County Redevelopment Project Area, so such designated area can not be impacted.
- e) Based on the nature of the project, it is not forecast to cause a cumulatively significant exceedance of official regional or local population projections.
- f) All required infrastructure is available within existing roadways, either adjacent to or near the project site. Therefore, no major extension of infrastructure, and related growth inducement, will result from implementing the proposed project. No significant population or housing impacts are forecast to occur from project implementation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the 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:

34. Fire Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will incrementally increase the demand for fire services within Riverside County. However, the project will not require the provision of new or altered government facilities at this time.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

This project has been conditioned to comply with the requirements of the Riverside Fire Protection Department and for the payment of standard mitigation fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 659.7.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary.

35. Sheriff Services

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will incrementally increase the demand for Sheriff's services within Riverside County. However, the project will not require the provision of new or altered government facilities at this time.

This project has been conditioned for the payment of standard mitigation fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 659.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary.

36. Schools

Source: San Jacinto Unified School District, GIS database

Findings of Fact: The project does not propose any permanent structures and no building permits will be issued. The project will not generate additional demand for educational services from the school district.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

37. Libraries

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The project will not create a significant incremental demand for library services.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

38. Health Services

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

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will not create a significant incremental demand for health services. The project will not require the provision of new or altered government facilities at this time.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

RECREATION

39. Parks and Recreation

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

a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or 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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Is the project located within a C.S.A. or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?

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

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications), Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees), Parks & Open Space Department Review

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project does not include provisions for recreational facilities so no adverse impact can result from its implementation.

b) The proposed project is not forecast to cause a significant increase in local population or in the demand for use of offsite existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

c) The proposed development is not located within a County Service Area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary.

40. Recreational Trails

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

Source: Open Space and Conservation Map for Western County trail alignments

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact:

The proposed project does not include the provision of recreational trails. The project will not directly add to the existing demand on local recreational trails. No significant impacts to regional recreational trails are forecast to occur as a result of project implementation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

41. Circulation

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) 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"/>
e) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially increase hazards 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"/>
g) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

- a) The Transportation Department has not required a traffic study for the proposed project. It has been determined that the project is exempt from any traffic study requirements. The project is accessed via a roadway easement that has been reviewed by and found acceptable, therefore the project will have no impact.
- b) The project will include sufficient parking and no special modifications or requirements are required, therefore there is no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- c) The Transportation Department has determined that the project will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways.
- d) The proposed project will not 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.
- e) The proposed project will not alter any waterborne, rail or air traffic as no such traffic occurs in the project area.
- f) The proposed project will not substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment) because no such features or incompatible uses will be cause by project implementation.
- g) The project will not cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads.
- h) The proposed project will not cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction.
- i) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses.
- j) The project's implementation will not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

42. Bike Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The proposed project does not include the provision of bicycle lanes as part of the project design. No conflicts with the County's General Plan have been identified and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

43. Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

a) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review and project application materials

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project is served by an existing well that is sufficient to provide water for the intermittent uses, therefore there is no impact.
- b) There is a sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

44. Sewer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service 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"/>

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project consists of RV/trailers that are mobile and shall be self contained with all necessary waste disposal abilities. No new wastewater treatment or dumping stations are proposed with the project, therefore there is no impact.
- b) Since the project is served by portable restrooms and the self contained RV/trailers, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

45. Solid Waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Is the project 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"/>
b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

(County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?

Source: RCIP, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project will not substantially alter existing or future solid waste generation patterns and disposal services.
- b) The project will be consistent with the County Integrated Waste Management Plan

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

46. Utilities

Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

a) Electricity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The project will not require or result in the construction of new community utilities or the expansion of existing community utility facilities. The project proposed self contained RV/trailers and shall not require additional services to serve the project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

47. Does the project have the potential to substantially 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

California history or prehistory?

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: 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 project, after the HANS review, is required to provide conservation easements over one hundred percent (100%) of the project site. The activities included in the project, the RV/trailer parking and the other gathering functions of the hunt club, will not endanger or have the potential to degrade the quality of any species.

48. Does the project have impacts which 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 other current projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

49. Does the project have environmental effects that 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"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Staff review, project application

Findings of Fact: The proposed project would not result in environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

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 as per California Code of Regulations, Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

RCIP: Riverside County Integrated Project.

Location Where Earlier Analyses, if used, are available for review:

Location: County of Riverside Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

Riverside, CA 92505

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\CUP03464\CUP03464 EA 5-27-09.doc
Revised: 6/9/08

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

EVERY DEPARTMENT

10. EVERY. 1 USE - PROJECT DESCRIPTION RECOMMND

The Conditional Use Permit proposes to permit an existing operation of a hunting club. The existing development is comprised of 11 RV/Trailer parking spaces, an 8 foot by 12 foot tool shed, and the existing well that serves the property. The proposed improvements that will occur only on the southerly 2 acres includes 8 additional RV parking spaces, two (2) 10 foot by 40 foot cargo containers, 20 automobile parking spaces, two (2) 7,500 gallon water storage tanks, a trap and skeet range area, and portable restrooms used only during the 5 month hunting period.

10. EVERY. 2 USE - HOLD HARMLESS RECOMMND

The applicant/permittee or any successor-in-interest shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County of Riverside (COUNTY) its agents, officers, or employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the COUNTY, its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the COUNTY, its advisory agencies, appeal boards, or legislative body concerning CUP03464. The COUNTY will promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding against the COUNTY and will cooperate fully in the defense. If the COUNTY fails to promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding or fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant/permittee shall not, thereafter, be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the COUNTY.

10. EVERY. 3 USE - DEFINITIONS RECOMMND

The words identified in the following list that appear in all capitals in the attached conditions of Conditional Use Permit No. 3464 shall be henceforth defined as follows:

APPROVED EXHIBIT A = Conditional Use Permit No. 3464, Exhibit A, Amended No. 1, dated 3/5/08.

10. EVERY. 4 USE - 90 DAYS TO PROTEST RECOMMND

The project developer has 90 days from the date of approval of these conditions to protest, in accordance with the procedures set forth in Government Code Section 66020, the imposition of any and all fees, dedications, reservations

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 4 USE - 90 DAYS TO PROTEST (cont.) RECOMMND

and/or other exactions imposed on this project as a result of this approval or conditional approval of this project.

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

10.BS GRADE. 1 USE -GIN INTRODUCTION RECOMMND

Improvements such as grading, filling, over excavation and recompaction, and base or paving which require a grading permit are subject to the included Building and Safety Department Grading Division conditions of approval.

10.BS GRADE. 3 USE-G1.2 OBEY ALL GDG REGS RECOMMND

All grading shall conform to the California Building Code, Ordinance 457, and all other relevant laws, rules, and regulations governing grading in Riverside County and prior to commencing any grading which includes 50 or more cubic yards, the applicant shall obtain a grading permit from the Building and Safety Department.

10.BS GRADE. 4 USE-G1.3 DISTURBS NEED G/PMT RECOMMND

Ordinance 457 requires a grading permit prior to clearing, grubbing, or any top soil disturbances related to construction grading.

10.BS GRADE. 5 USE-G1.6 DUST CONTROL RECOMMND

All necessary measures to control dust shall be implemented by the developer during grading. PM10 plan may be required at the time a grading permit is issued.

10.BS GRADE. 6 USE-G2.3SLOPE EROS CL PLAN RECOMMND

Erosion control - landscape plans, required for manufactured slopes greater than 3 feet in vertical height, are to be signed by a registered landscape architect and bonded per the requirements of Ordinance 457 (refer to dept. form 284-47).

10.BS GRADE. 7 USE-G2.5 2:1 MAX SLOPE RATIO RECOMMND

Graded slopes shall be limited to a maximum steepness ratio of 2:1 (horizontal to vertical) unless otherwise approved.

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.BS GRADE. 8 USE-G2.6SLOPE STABL'TY ANLYS RECOMMND

A slope stability report shall be submitted and approved by the County Geologist for all proposed cut or fill slopes steeper than 2:1 (horiz. to vert.) or over 30' in vertical height - unless addressed in a previous report.

10.BS GRADE. 9 USE-G2.7DRNAGE DESIGN Q100 RECOMMND

All grading and drainage shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's conditions of approval regarding this application. If not specifically addressed in their conditions, drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100 year storm flows.

Additionally, the Building and Safety Department's conditional approval of this application includes an expectation that the conceptual grading plan reviewed and approved for it complies or can comply with any WQMP (water Quality Management Plan) required by Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District.

10.BS GRADE. 10 USE-G2.8MINIMUM DRNAGE GRADE RECOMMND

Minimum drainage grade shall be 1% except on portland cement concrete where .35% shall be the minimum.

10.BS GRADE. 11 USE-G2.9DRNAGE & TERRACING RECOMMND

Provide drainage facilities and terracing in conformance with the Uniform Building Code's chapter on "EXCAVATION & GRADING".

10.BS GRADE. 12 USE-G2.10 SLOPE SETBACKS RECOMMND

Observe slope setbacks from buildings & property lines per the Uniform Building Code as amended by Ordinance 457.

10.BS GRADE. 13 USE-G2.23 OFFST. PAVED PKG RECOMMND

All offstreet parking areas which are conditioned to be paved shall conform to Ordinance 457 base and paving design and inspection requirements.

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.BS GRADE. 14 USE-G.3.1NO B/PMT W/O G/PMT RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the property owner shall obtain a grading permit and/or approval to construct from the Grading Division of the Building and Safety Department.

10.BS GRADE. 15 USE-G3.3RETAINING WALLS RECOMMND

Lots which propose retaining walls will require separate permits. They shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any other building permits - unless otherwise approved by the Building and Safety Director. The walls shall be designed by a Registered Civil Engineer - unless they conform to the County Standard Retaining Wall designs shown on the Building and Safety Department form 284-197.

10.BS GRADE. 17 USE-G4.1E-CL 4:1 OR STEEPER RECOMMND

Plant & irrigate all manufactured slopes steeper than a 4:1 (horizontal to vertical) ratio and 3 feet or greater in vertical height with grass or ground cover; slopes 15 feet or greater in vertical height shall be planted with additional shrubs or trees or as approved by the Building & Safety Department's Erosion Control Specialist.

10.BS GRADE. 18 USE-G4.3PAVING INSPECTIONS RECOMMND

The developer/applicant shall be responsible for obtaining the paving inspections required by Ordinance 457.

10.BS GRADE. 20 USE-G1.4 NPDES/SWPPP RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of any grading or construction permits - whichever comes first - the applicant shall provide the Building and Safety Department evidence of compliance with the following: "Effective March 10, 2003 owner operators of grading or construction projects are required to comply with the N.P.D.E.S. (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB). The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of "ONE" acre or larger. The owner operator can comply by submitting a "Notice of Intent" (NOI), develop and implement a STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site.

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.BS GRADE. 20 USE-G1.4 NPDES/SWPPP (cont.)

RECOMMND

For additional information and to obtain a copy of the NPDES State Construction Permit contact the SWRCB at (916) 657-1146.

Additionally, at the time the county adopts, as part of any ordinance, regulations specific to the N.P.D.E.S., this project (or subdivision) shall comply with them.

E HEALTH DEPARTMENT

10.E HEALTH. 1 USE - NO RESTROOMS/FACILITIES

RECOMMND

If permanent restroom or sanitation facilities are required, the Department of Environmental Health is to be contacted for specific recommendations regarding water and sewerage. (Currently the RV usage for overnight stay is for self contained units only. (No potable water or waste disposal at this time).

EPD DEPARTMENT

10.EPD. 1 MSHCP UWIG COMPLIANCE

RECOMMND

The project shall comply with the Western Riverside Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Sections 6.1.4 Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines (UWIG) and 7.5.3 Construction Guidelines. Areas of compliance include, but are not limited to:

1) Brush management to reduce fuel loads to protect urban uses (fuel modification zones) will occur only in the boundaries of the development. Fuel modification zones will not encroach into the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habit Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Conservation Area(s) and/or Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) Lands.

2) Night lighting shall be directed away from the MSHCP Conservation Area(s) and/or PQP Lands. Shielding shall be incorporated in project designs to ensure ambient lighting in the MSHCP Conservation Area(s) and/or PQP Lands do not increase.

3) All landscaping shall conform to the MSHCP, Section 6 in Table 6.2. on pages 6-44 through 6-64.

4) Manufactured slopes associated with proposed site

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.EPD. 1 MSHCP UWIG COMPLIANCE (cont.)

RECOMMND

development shall not extend into the MSHCP Conservation Area(s) and/or PQP Lands.

5)Noise levels shall not exceed residential noise standards.

6)All drainages shall be kept clear of toxins and ensure that the quantity and quality of runoff discharged from the site are not adversely altered from existing conditions.

7)New roads or trails shall not extend into the MSHCP Conservation Area(s) and/or PQP Lands.

8)Fencing, which restricts the movement of wildlife, shall not be allowed in the MSHCP Conservation Area(s) and/or PQP Lands. Prohibited fencing includes, but is not limited to, chainlink, barbed wire, block wall, and solid wood.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

10.FIRE. 1 USE -CONDITIONS

RECOMMND

ROAD SIGNS SHALL BE INPLACE BY 12/31/09.

GRAVEL ON ROAD SHALL BE DONE BY 3/31/10.

15,000 GALLON WATER TANK WITH FIRE KIT SHALL BE INSTALLED BY 3/31/10.

R.V.'S SHALL BE ROAD WORTHY AT ALL TIMES.

100 FOOT VEGETATION CLEARANCE SHALL BE MAINTAINED AROUND ALL STRUCTURES AND R.V.'S AT ALL TIMES.

NO RV'S OR STRUCTURES WILL BE ALLOWED UNTIL GRAVEL ROAD SURFACE AND WATER STORAGE TANK ARE IN PLACE AND APPROVED AND INSPECTED BY THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT.

10.FIRE. 3 USE-#25-GATE ENTRANCES

RECOMMND

Any gate providing access from a road to a driveway shall be located at least 35 feet from the roadway and shall open to allow a vehicle to stop without obstructing traffic on the road. Where a one-way road with a single traffic lane provides access to a gate entrance, a 38 foot turning radius shall be used.

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.FIRE. 4

USE-#88A-AUTO/MAN GATES

RECOMMND

Gate(s) shall be automatic operated, minimum 20 feet in width, with a setback of 35 feet from face of curb/flow line. Gate access shall be equipped with a rapid entry system. Plans shall be submitted to the Fire Department for approval prior to installation. Automatic/manual gate pins shall be rated with shear pin force, not to exceed 30 foot pounds. Automatic gates shall be equipped with emergency backup power. Gates activated by the rapid entry system shall remain open until closed by the rapid entry system.

FLOOD RI DEPARTMENT

10.FLOOD RI. 1

USE FLOOD HAZARD REPORT

RECOMMND

CUP 03464 is a proposal to continue the operation of a duck hunting club with ancillary clay target shooting and Recreational Vehicle (RV) usage for overnight stay. The property is located northerly of Ramona Expressway, southerly of Gilman Springs Road and easterly of Davis Road.

The site is located within the San Jacinto River floodplain and floodway. The site is located in the 100-year Zone A1 floodplain limits as delineated on Panel No. 06065C0790G and Panel No. 06065C1455G of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps issued in conjunction with the National Flood Insurance Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

All of the proposed extended RV spaces are located within the FEMA floodplain/floodway. According to Flood Plain Management Ordinance 458, an RV within a mapped FEMA floodplain/floodway is considered temporary if it is, i) built on a single chassis, ii) 400 square feet or less iii) designed to be self propelled or permanently towable by a light duty truck and, iv) designed for temporary uses like recreation, camping, travel and seasonal. Therefore, if a vehicle cannot meet any of these criteria, for example, it has to be moved by a commercial semi-truck, it would then not qualify as an RV.

If a vehicle that qualifies as an RV under the above definition is onsite for fewer than 180 days, or is fully licensed and ready for highway use, then no floodproofing is required. New permanent RVs and/or structures are unacceptable. No grading or building permits for any new

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.FLOOD RI. 1 USE FLOOD HAZARD REPORT (cont.) RECOMMND

structures shall be issued on this property.

10.FLOOD RI. 2 USE FEMA PANEL NO RECOMMND

CUP 03464 is within the 100-year Zone A1 flood plain/floodway limits as delineated on Panel No. 06065C0790G and Panel No. 06065C1455G of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps issued in conjunction with the National Flood Insurance Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

10.FLOOD RI. 3 USE RV'S IN THE FLOODPLAIN RECOMMND

In accordance with Ordinance 458, any RV placed within a mapped FEMA floodplain shall be of a 'temporary' nature. An RV is only considered temporary if it meets all of the following criteria: i) built on a single chassis, ii) 400 square feet or less iii) designed to be self propelled or permanently towable by a light duty truck and, iv) designed for temporary uses like recreation, camping, travel and seasonal. If a vehicle meets these criteria as a 'temporary' RV and is onsite for fewer than 180 days or is fully licensed and ready for highway use, then no floodproofing is required.

10.FLOOD RI. 4 USE NO PERMANENT STRUCTURES RECOMMND

New permanent RVs and structures are unacceptable.

10.FLOOD RI. 5 USE NO GRADING/BUILDING PERMIT RECOMMND

No grading or building permits shall be issued on this site.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

10.PLANNING. 40 USE - GEOLOGIST'S COMMENTS RECOMMND

AS THIS ENTITLEMENT DOES NOT CONTEMPLATE STRUCTURES FOR HUMAN OCCUPANCY, NO GEOLOGIC STUDY IS REQUIRED AT THIS TIME. IF, IN THE FUTURE, STRUCTURES FOR HUMAN OCCUPANCY ARE REQUIRED, A COMPREHENSIVE GEOLOGIC REPORT SHALL BE REQUIRED AS DESCRIBED BELOW AND AS DESCRIBED ELSEWHERE IN THIS CONDITIONS SET:

A geologic/geotechnical investigation report. The

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 40 USE - GEOLOGIST'S COMMENTS (cont.) RECOMMND

investigation shall address geologic hazards including, but not necessarily limited to, slope stability, rock fall hazards, landslide hazards, surface fault rupture, fissures, liquefaction potential, collapsible and/or expansive soils, subsidence, wind and water erosion, debris flows, and groundshaking potential. The report shall be reviewed and approved by the County Engineering Geologist.

10.PLANNING. 41 MAP - IF HUMAN REMAINS FOUND RECOMMND

If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 5097.98(b) remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within a resonable timeframe. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the "most likely descendant." The most likely descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

10.PLANNING. 42 MAP - INADVERTENT ARCHAEO FIND RECOMMND

If during ground disturbance activities, unique cultural resources are discovered that were not assessed by the archaeological report(s) and/or environmental assessment conducted prior to project approval, the following procedures shall be followed. Unique cultural resources are defined, for this condition, as being multiple artifacts in close association with each other, but may include fewer artifacts if the area of the find is determined to be of significance due to its sacred or cultural importance.

1. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the archaeologist, the Native American tribal representative and the Planning Director to discuss the significance of the find.

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 42 MAP - INADVERTENT ARCHAEO FIND (cont.) RECOMMND

2. At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed and after consultation with the Native American tribal representative and the archaeologist, a decision shall be made, with the concurrence of the Planning Director, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resources.

3. Grading of further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to the appropriate mitigation.

10.PLANNING. 43 USE - COMPLY WITH ORD./CODES RECOMMND

The development of these premises shall comply with the standards of Ordinance No. 348 and all other applicable Riverside County ordinances and State and Federal codes.

The development of the premises shall conform substantially with that as shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT A, unless otherwise amended by these conditions of approval.

10.PLANNING. 44 USE - FEES FOR REVIEW RECOMMND

Any subsequent submittals required by these conditions of approval, including but not limited to grading plan, building plan or mitigation monitoring review, shall be reviewed on an hourly basis (research fee), or other such review fee as may be in effect at the time of submittal, as required by Ordinance No. 671. Each submittal shall be accompanied with a letter clearly indicating which condition or conditions the submittal is intended to comply with.

10.PLANNING. 45 USE - LIGHTING HOODED/DIRECTED RECOMMND

Any outside lighting shall be hooded and directed so as not to shine directly upon adjoining property or public rights-of-way.

10.PLANNING. 46 USE - COLORS & MATERIALS RECOMMND

Building colors and materials shall be in substantial conformance with those shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT B.

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 51 USE - NO OUTDOOR ADVERTISING RECOMMND

No outdoor advertising display, sign or billboard (not including on-site advertising or directional signs) shall be constructed or maintained within the property subject to this approval.

10.PLANNING. 54 USE - PHASE BY NEW PERMIT RECOMMND

Construction of this project may be done progressively in phases provided a plan is submitted with appropriate fees to the Planning Department and approved prior to issuance of any building permits. Phasing approval shall not apply to the requirements of any agency other than the Planning Department unless so indicated by the affected agency.

10.PLANNING. 55 USE - LANDSCAPE SPECIES RECOMMND

Drought tolerant and native plant species shall be preferred over non-drought tolerant and non-native species. However, the quantity and extent of those species shall depend on the project's climatic zones. Alternative types of low volume irrigation are encouraged to be used in order to conserve water.

10.PLANNING. 61 USE - NO RESIDENT OCCUPANCY RECOMMND

No permanent occupancy shall be permitted within the property approved under this conditional use permit as a principal place of residence except a caretaker's dwelling. No person, except a caretaker and members of the caretaker's family, shall use the premises as a permanent mailing address nor be entitled to vote using an address within the premises as a place of residence.

10.PLANNING. 62 USE - MAINTAIN LICENSING RECOMMND

At all times during the conduct of the permitted use individuals participating in hunting or similar activities shall maintain and keep in effect valid licensing approval from the California Department of Fish and Game, or equivalent agency as provided by law when required by that agency. Should such licensing be denied, expire or lapse at any time in the future, those individuals without proper licensing, may not participate in such activities.

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 63 USE - EXTERIOR NOISE LEVELS RECOMMND

Exterior noise levels produced by any use allowed under this permit, including, but not limited to, any outdoor public address system, shall not exceed 45 db(A), 10-minute LEQ, as measured from the property boundaries. In the event noise exceeds this standard, the permittee or the permittee's successor-in-interest shall take the necessary steps to remedy the situation, which may include discontinued operation of the facilities.

10.PLANNING. 64 USE - NOISE MONITORING REPORTS RECOMMND

The permit holder may be required to submit periodic noise monitoring reports as determined by the Department of Building and Safety as part of a code enforcement action. Upon written notice from the Department of Building and Safety requiring such a report, the permittee or the permittee's successor-in-interest shall prepare and submit an approved report within thirty (30) calendar days to the Department of Building and Safety, unless more time is allowed through written agreement by the Department of Building and Safety. The noise monitoring report shall be approved by the Office of Industrial Hygiene of the Health Service Agency (the permittee or the permittee's successor-in-interest shall be required to place on deposit sufficient funds to cover the costs of this approval prior to commencing the required report).

10.PLANNING. 66 USE - CAUSES FOR REVOCATION RECOMMND

In the event the use hereby permitted under this permit, a) is found to be in violation of the terms and conditions of this permit, b) is found to have been obtained by fraud or perjured testimony, or c) is found to be detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare, or is a public nuisance, this permit shall be subject to the revocation procedures.

10.PLANNING. 72 USE - MT PALOMAR LIGHTING AREA RECOMMND

Within the Mt. Palomar Special Lighting Area, as defined in Ordinance No. 655, low pressure sodium vapor lighting or overhead high pressure sodium vapor lighting with shields or cutoff luminaires, shall be utilized.

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 79 USE - BUSINESS LICENSING

RECOMMND

Every person conducting a business within the unincorporated area of Riverside County, as defined in Riverside County Ordinance No. 857, shall obtain a business license. For more information regarding business registration, contact the Business Registration and License Program Office of the Building and Safety Department at www.rctlma.org.buslic.

10.PLANNING. 80 USE - VIABLE LANDSCAPING

RECOMMND

All plant materials within landscaped areas shall be maintained in a viable growth condition throughout the life of this permit. To ensure that this occurs, the Planning Department shall require inspections in accordance with the Planning Department's Milestone 90 condition entitled "USE - LNDSCP/IRRIG INSTALL INS."

10.PLANNING. 81 USE - LANDSCAPING REVIEW/COMPL

RECOMMND

All landscaping plans shall be prepared in accordance with Ordinance 859 (as adopted and any amendments thereto), the Riverside County Guide to California Landscaping, and Ordinance 348, Section 18.12. Such plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department, the appropriate maintenance authority, and shall be in conformance with the PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPING plans.

10.PLANNING. 82 USE - RV PARK STANDARDS

RECOMMND

The project shall be consistent with the following development standards contained in Ordinance 348, Article XIXd, section 19.98 - Development Standards for Vacation Recreational Vehicle Parks. Accessory structures:

(1) No accessory structures including, but not limited to, ramadas, cabanas, and storage structures, shall be constructed on individual recreational vehicle spaces except patio covers may be constructed provided the following criteria are met and maintained:

a. The patio covers are located or constructed and maintained by the park owner must be temporary in nature.

b. The patio covers are self-supporting and in no way permanently attached to a recreational vehicle.

DITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 82 USE - RV PARK STANDARDS (cont.)

RECOMMND

c. Any patio cover or fencing that obstructs the removal of a trailer from a space shall be equipped with bolts or otherwise designed to facilitate removal of the trailers with not more than 30 minutes of preparation time.

(2) All awnings shall be supported off the individual recreational vehicle, shall remain attached to the recreational vehicle at all times, and shall not be connected in any way to a permanent structure. Free standing awnings shall not be permitted.

Recreational vehicles parked on the site shall be in a roadworthy condition. A roadworthy condition is hereby defined as: equipped with valid registration tags, supported by an axle, equipped with operable brake and tail lights, having access to tires that will allow the trailer to be driven from the site with not more than 30 minutes of preparation time.

During periods of non-occupancy, RVs shall be permitted to remain on-site.

TRANS DEPARTMENT

10.TRANS. 1 USE - TS/EXEMPT

RECOMMND

The Transportation Department has not required a traffic study for the subject project. The Transportation Department has determined that the project is exempt from traffic study requirements.

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

EPD DEPARTMENT

20.EPD. 1 MSHCP CONSERVATION EASEMENT

RECOMMND

Within the first 6 months of approval and prior to use, building permit issuance, or grading permit issuance, which ever comes first, as agreed to by the APPLICANT through the Habitat Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS file # 1533), established by the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, a conservation easement over the entire project area boundary as shown on CUP 3464 AMENDED #2 EXHIBIT dated 12/17/08, shall be offered to the Western Riverside County Regional

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

20.EPD. 1

MSHCP CONSERVATION EASEMENT (cont.)

RECOMMND

Conservation Authority (RCA), as County direct or authorized and accepted by the RCA. Prior to the acceptance of the conservation easement by the RCA, the RCA shall obtain a preliminary title report and conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for the area covered by the conservation easement. The applicant shall provide access to the project site to the RCA and their agents for the purposes of conducting the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. The RCA shall have sole and absolute discretion concerning the approval and acceptance of the information contained in the preliminary title report and Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. Title to the property covered by the conservation easement shall be free and clear of all liens, encumbrances, easements, roads and leases (recorded and unrecorded) except those lien, encumbrances, easements, and leases, which are the sole discretion of the RCA.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

20.PLANNING. 1

USE - EXPIRATION DATE-CUP

RECOMMND

This approval shall be used within two (2) years of approval date; otherwise, it shall become null and void and of no effect whatsoever. By use is meant the beginning of substantial construction contemplated by this approval within a two (2) year period which is thereafter diligently pursued to completion or the actual occupancy of existing buildings or land under the terms of the authorized use. Prior to the expiration of the two year period, the permittee may request a one (1) year extension of time request in which to use this plot plan. A maximum of three one-year extension of time requests shall be permitted. Should the time period established by any of the extension of time requests lapse, or should all three one-year extensions be obtained and no substantial construction or use of this plot plan be initiated within five (5) years of the effective date of the issuance of this plot plan, this plot plan shall become null and void.

20.PLANNING. 3

USE - REVIEW OPERATION HOURS

RECOMMND

One (1) year after issuance of occupancy permit the Planning Director and the Director of Building and Safety may review this permit to consider the hours of operation. If significant complaints have been received regarding

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

20.PLANNING. 3 USE - REVIEW OPERATION HOURS (cont.) RECOMMND

noise and nuisance, the hours of operation of the private hunt club may be further restricted.

20.PLANNING. 6 USE - EXISTING STRUCTURE CHECK RECOMMND

WITHIN SIXTY (60) DAYS OF THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS PERMIT, the permittee or the permittee's successors-in-interest shall apply to the Building and Safety Department for all necessary permits, including the submission of all required documents and fees for any plan check review as determined by the Director of the Department of Building and Safety, to ensure that all existing buildings, structures and uses are in compliance with Ordinance No. 348 and Ordinance No. 457 and the conditions of approval of this permit.

20.PLANNING. 7 USE - LIFE OF PERMIT RECOMMND

Conditional Use Permit No. 3464 shall remain valid and ineffect, subject to the Conditions of Approval contained herein and all applicable Riverside County Ordinances and Policies, unless the subject permit is revoked by the County of Riverside.

20.PLANNING. 8 USE - CLUB BY-LAWS RECOMMND

Within ninety (90) days of the approval of this permit, the Hunt Club shall provide by-laws and other policy documents, agreed to by all members of the Club, restricting the use of lead shot in the trap and skeet area of the proposed project. The documents shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to any trap and skeet use on the project site.

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

60.BS GRADE. 1 USE-G2.1 GRADING BONDS RECOMMND

Grading in excess of 199 cubic yards will require performance security to be posted with the Building and Safety Department. Single Family Dwelling units graded one lot per permit and proposing to grade less than 5,000 cubic yards are exempt.

08/24/09
11:08

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 17

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.BS GRADE. 2 USE-G2.3SLOPE EROS CL PLAN

RECOMMND

Erosion control - landscape plans, required for manufactured slopes greater than 3 feet in vertical height, are to be signed by a registered landscape architect and bonded per the requirements of Ordinance 457, see form 284-47.

60.BS GRADE. 3 USE-G2.4GEOTECH/SOILS RPTS

RECOMMND

Geotechnical soils reports, required in order to obtain a grading permit, shall be submitted to the Building and Safety Department's Grading Division for review and approval prior to issuance of a grading permit.

All grading shall be in conformance with the recommendations of the geotechnical/soils reports as approved by Riverside County.*

*The geotechnical/soils, compaction and inspection reports will be reviewed in accordance with the RIVERSIDE COUNTY GEOTECHNICAL GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF GEOTECHNICAL AND GEOLOGIC REPORTS.

60.BS GRADE. 4 USE-G2.7DRNAGE DESIGN Q100

RECOMMND

All grading and drainage shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's conditions of approval regarding this application. If not specifically addressed in their conditions, drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100 year storm flows.

Additionally, the Building and Safety Department's conditional approval of this application includes an expectation that the conceptual grading plan reviewed and approved for it complies or can comply with any WQMP (water Quality Management Plan) required by Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District.

60.BS GRADE. 7 USE-G2.15NOTRD OFFSITE LTR

RECOMMND

A notarized letter of permission, from the affected property owners or easement holders, is required for any proposed off site grading.

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.BS GRADE. 9 USE-G1.4 NPDES/SWPPP

RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of any grading or construction permits - whichever comes first - the applicant shall provide the Building and Safety Department evidence of compliance with the following: "Effective March 10, 2003 owner operators of grading or construction projects are required to comply with the N.P.D.E.S. (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB). The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of "ONE" acre or larger. The owner operator can comply by submitting a "Notice of Intent" (NOI), develop and implement a STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site. For additional information and to obtain a copy of the NPDES State Construction Permit contact the SWRCB at (916) 657-1146.

Additionally, at the time the county adopts, as part of any ordinance, regulations specific to the N.P.D.E.S., this project (or subdivision) shall comply with them.

60.BS GRADE. 10 USE IMPORT/EXPORT

RECOMMND

In instances where a grading plan involves import or export, prior to obtaining a grading permit, the applicant shall have obtained approval for the import/export location from the Building and Safety department. If an Environmental Assessment, prior to issuing a grading permit, did not previously approve either location, a Grading Environmental Assessment shall be submitted to the Planning Director and the Environmental Programs Director for review and comment and to the Building and Safety Department Director for approval. Additionally, if the movement of import/export occurs using county roads, review and approval of the haul routes by the Transportation Department will be required.

EPD DEPARTMENT

60.EPD. 1 MSHCP CONSERVATION EASEMENT

RECOMMND

Prior to use, building permit issuance, or grading permit issuance, which ever comes first, as agreed to by the Applicant through the Habitat Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS file # 1533), established by the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.EPD. 1 MSHCP CONSERVATION EASEMENT (cont.) RECOMMND

Plan, a conservation easement over the entire project area boundary as shown on the CUP 3464 AMENDED #2 Exhibit dated 12/17/08, shall be offered to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), as County directs or authorizes and accepted by the RCA. Prior to the acceptance of the conservation easement by the RCA, the RCA shall obtain a preliminary title report and conduct a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment for the area covered by the conservation easement. The applicant shall provide access to the project site to the RCA and their agents for purposes of conducting the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment. The RCA shall have sole and absolute discretion concerning approval and acceptance of the information contained in the preliminary title report and Phase 1 Environmental Assessment. Title to the property covered by the conservation easement shall be free and clear of all liens, encumbrances, easements, roads and leases (recorded or unrecorded) except those liens, encumbrances, easements and leases, which are the sole discretion of the RCA.

FLOOD RI DEPARTMENT

60.FLOOD RI. 1 USE NO GRADING/BUILDING PERMIT RECOMMND

No grading or building permits shall be issued on this site.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

60.PLANNING. 19 USE - GEOLOGIC STUDY RECOMMND

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS (IF GRADING IS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PLACING STRUCTURES FOR HUMAN OCCUPANCY ON THIS SITE), THE FOLLOWING SPECIAL GEOLOGIC STUDIES SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE COUNTY GEOLOGIST:

A geologic/geotechnical investigation report. The investigation shall address geologic hazards including, but not necessarily limited to, slope stability, rock fall hazards, landslide hazards, surface fault rupture, fissures, liquefaction potential, collapsible and/or expansive soils, subsidence, wind and water erosion, debris flows, and groundshaking potential. The report shall be reviewed and approved by the County Engineering Geologist.

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.PLANNING. 31 USE - FEE STATUS

RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Conditional Use Permit No. 3464, the Planning Department shall determine the status of the deposit based fees. If the fees are in a negative status, the permit holder shall pay the outstanding balance.

60.PLANNING. 32 USE - PLNTLOGST RETAINED

RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of grading permits, a qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the developer for consultation and comment on the proposed grading with respect to potential paleontological impacts. Should the paleontologist find the potential is high for impact to significant resources, a pre-grade meeting between the paleontologist and the excavation and grading contractor shall be arranged. When necessary, the paleontologist or representative shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect, or halt grading activity to allow recovery of fossils. The developer shall submit the name, telephone number and address of the retained paleontologist to the Planning Department.

The paleontologist shall submit in writing to the Planning Department the results of the initial consultation and the details of the fossil recovery plan if recovery was deemed necessary. The written results shall be submitted prior to issuance of grading permit.

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

80.BS GRADE. 1 USE* -G3.1NO B/PMT W/O G/PMT

RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of any building permit, the property owner shall obtain a grading permit and/or approval to construct from the Grading Division of the Building and Safety Department.

EPD DEPARTMENT

80.EPD. 1 MSHCP CONSERVATION EASEMENT

RECOMMND

Prior to use, building permit issuance or grading permit issuance, which ever comes first, as agreed to by the Applicant through the Habitat Acquisition Negotiation

08/24/09
11:08

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 21

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.EPD. 1 MSHCP CONSERVATION EASEMENT (cont.)

RECOMMND

Strategy (HANS file # 1533), established by the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, a conservation easement over the entire project area boundary as shown on the CUP 3464 AMENDED #2 Exhibit dated 12/17/08, shall be offered to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), as County directs or authorizes and accepted by the RCA. Prior to the acceptance of the conservation easement by the RCA, the RCA shall obtain a preliminary title report and conduct a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment for the area covered by the conservation easement. The applicant shall provide access to the project site to the RCA and their agents for purposes of conducting the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment. The RCA shall have sole and absolute discretion concerning approval and acceptance of the information contained in the preliminary title report and Phase 1 Environmental Assessment. Title to the property covered by the conservation easement shall be free and clear of all liens, encumbrances, easements, roads and leases (recorded or unrecorded) except those liens, encumbrances, easements and leases, which are the sole discretion of the RCA.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

80.FIRE. 1 USE-#17A-BLDG PLAN CHECK \$

RECOMMND

Building Plan check deposit base fee of \$1,056.00, shall be paid in a check or money order to the Riverside County Fire Department after plans have been approved by our office.

FLOOD RI DEPARTMENT

80.FLOOD RI. 1 USE NO GRADING/BUILDING PERMIT

RECOMMND

No grading or building permits shall be issued on this site.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

80.PLANNING. 45 USE - GEOLOGIC STUDY

RECOMMND

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS (IF STRUCTURES FOR HUMAN OCCUPANCY), THE FOLLOWING SPECIAL GEOLOGIC STUDIES SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE COUNTY GEOLOGIST:

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.PLANNING. 45 USE - GEOLOGIC STUDY (cont.) RECOMMND

A geologic/geotechnical investigation report. The investigation shall address geologic hazards including, but not necessarily limited to, slope stability, rock fall hazards, landslide hazards, surface fault rupture, fissures, liquefaction potential, collapsible and/or expansive soils, subsidence, wind and water erosion, debris flows, and groundshaking potential. The report shall be reviewed and approved by the County Engineering Geologist.

80.PLANNING. 48 USE - CONFORM TO ELEVATIONS RECOMMND

Elevations of all buildings and structures submitted for building plan check approval shall be in substantial conformance with the elevations shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT B.

80.PLANNING. 50 USE - ROOF EQUIPMENT SHIELDING RECOMMND

Roof mounted equipment shall be shielded from ground view. Screening material shall be subject to Planning Department approval.

80.PLANNING. 62 USE - SCHOOL MITIGATION RECOMMND

Impacts to the San Jacinto Unified School District shall be mitigated in accordance with California State law.

80.PLANNING. 65 USE - LIGHTING PLANS RECOMMND

All parking lot lights and other outdoor lighting shall be shown on electrical plans submitted to the Department of Building and Safety for plan check approval and shall comply with the requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 and the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan.

80.PLANNING. 66 USE - FEE STATUS RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of building permits for Conditional Use Permit No. 3464, the Planning Department shall determine the status of the deposit based fees for project. If the case fees are in a negative state, the permit holder shall pay the outstanding balance.

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.PLANNING. 68 USE - LANDSCAPING SECURITIES

RECOMMND

Performance securities, in amounts to be determined by the Director of Building and Safety to guarantee the installation of plantings, irrigation system, walls and/or fences, in accordance with the approved plan, shall be filed with the Department of Building and Safety. Securities may require review by County Counsel and other staff. Permit holder is encouraged to allow adequate time to ensure that securities are in place. The performance security may be released one year after structural final, inspection report, and the One-Year Post Establishment report confirms that the planting and irrigation components have been adequately installed and maintained. A cash security shall be required when the estimated cost is \$2,500.00 or less.

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

90.BS GRADE. 1 USE*G4.3PAVING INSPECTIONS

RECOMMND

The developer/applicant shall be responsible for obtaining the paving inspections required by Ordinance 457.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

90.FIRE. 1 USE-#45-FIRE LANES

RECOMMND

The applicant shall prepare and submit to the Fire Department for approval, a site plan designating required fire lanes with appropriate lane painting and/or signs.

90.FIRE. 2 USE-#27-EXTINGUISHERS

RECOMMND

Install portable fire extinguishers with a minimum rating of 2A-10BC and signage. Fire Extinguishers located in public areas shall be in recessed cabinets mounted 48" (inches) to center above floor level with maximum 4" projection from the wall. Contact Fire Department for proper placement of equipment prior to installation.

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

90.PLANNING. 8 USE - ROOF EQUIPMENT SHIELDING RECOMMND

Roof-mounted equipment shall be shielded from ground view. Screening material shall be subject to Planning Department approval.

90.PLANNING. 11 USE - UTILITIES UNDERGROUND RECOMMND

All utilities, except electrical lines rated 33 kV or greater, shall be installed underground. If the permittee provides to the Department of Building and Safety and the Planning Department a definitive statement from the utility provider refusing to allow underground installation of the utilities they provide, this condition shall be null and void with respect to that utility.

90.PLANNING. 25 USE - CONDITION COMPLIANCE RECOMMND

The Department of Building and Safety shall verify that the Development Standards of this approval and all other preceding conditions have been complied with prior to any use allowed by this permit.

90.PLANNING. 28 USE - ORD 810 O S FEE (2) RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, or upon building permit final inspection prior to use or occupancy for cases without final inspection or certificate of occupancy (such as an SMP), whichever comes first, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 810, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance. The amount of the fee will be based on the "Project Area" as defined in the Ordinance and the aforementioned Condition of Approval. The Project Area for Conditional Use Permit No. 3464 is calculated to be 1.37 acres. In the event Riverside County Ordinance No. 810 is rescinded, this condition will no longer be applicable. However, should Riverside County Ordinance No. 810 be rescinded and superseded by a subsequent mitigation fee ordinance, payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance shall be required.

08/24/09.
11:08

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 25

ADDITIONAL USE PERMIT Case #: CUP03464

Parcel: 425-050-025

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.PLANNING. 29

USE - ORD NO. 659 (DIF)

RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of either a certificate of occupancy or prior to building permit final inspection, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance. Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 has been established to set forth policies, regulations and fees related to the funding and installation of facilities and fees related to the funding and installation of facilities and the acquisition of open space and habitat necessary to address the direct and cumulative environmental effects generated by new development project described and defined in this Ordinance, and it establishes the authorized uses of the fees collected.

The amount of the fee for commercial or industrial development shall be calculated on the basis of the "Project Area," as defined in the Ordinance, which shall mean the net area, measured in acres, from the adjacent road right-of-way to the limits of the project development. The Project Area for Conditional Use Permit No. 3464 has been calculated to be 1.37 acres.

In the event Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 is rescinded, this condition will no longer be applicable. However, should Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 be rescinded and superseded by a subsequent mitigation fee ordinance, payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance shall be required.

COMPREHENSIVE PROJECT REVIEW
(*INITIAL CASE ACCEPTANCE) COMMENT AGENDA
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
9TH FLOOR, CAC - P.O. Box 1409
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

DATE: **October 12, 2005**

Transportation
Environmental Health
Flood Control District
Fire Department
Building & Safety (Grading)
Regional Parks & Open Space
Geologist
EPD
Donna Duron
Sheriff's Dept
Riv. Co. Waste
CSA #152

Supervisor Ashley
Commissioner Zuppardo
Riverside Transit Agency
City of Moreno Valley
San Jacinto Unified School Dist.
Eastern Municipal Water Dist.
So. Calif. Edison
Caltrans#8
Caltrans Aeronautics Division – David Cohen
Regional Quality Control Board #8
EIC(Attachment "A")

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03464 – EA40284 – Applicant: Ramona Duck Club – Engineer/Rep.: Overton Kuhn – Fifth Supervisorial District – Hemet-San Jacinto Zoning District, Lakeview Zoning Area – Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan: Open Space: Conservation (OS-C) – Location: Northerly of Ramona Expressway, southerly of Gilman Springs Road, and easterly of Davis Road – 92.21 Gross Acres – Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R), Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) – REQUEST: Continued operation as a duck hunting club with ancillary clay target shooting and RV usage for overnight stay. – APNs: 423-040-017, 423-050-008, 025

Please review the case described above, along with the attached tentative map/exhibit **This case is scheduled for a CPR meeting on November 3, 2005**. **All County Agencies and Departments, please have draft conditions in the Land Management System by the above date.** If you cannot clear the exhibit, please have corrections in the system and DENY the routing. Once the route is complete, and the approval screen is approved with or without corrections, the case can be scheduled for a public hearing. All other agencies, please have your comments/conditions to the Planning Department as soon as possible. Your comments/recommendations/conditions are requested so that they may be incorporated in the staff report for this particular case.

Should you have any questions regarding this item, please do not hesitate to contact **Russell Brady**, Project Planner, at (909) 955-1888.

COMMENTS:

DATE: SIGNATURE:
PLEASE PRINT NAME AND TITLE:
TELEPHONE:

If you do not use this letter for your response, please indicate the project planner's name. Thank you

COMPREHENSIVE PROJECT REVIEW
(*INITIAL CASE ACCEPTANCE) COMMENT AGENDA
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

9TH FLOOR, CAC - P.O. Box 1409

Riverside, CA 92502-1409

RECEIVED
OCT 20 2005

DATE: October 12, 2005

Transportation
Environmental Health
Flood Control District
Fire Department
Building & Safety (Grading)
Regional Parks & Open Space
Geologist
EPD
Donna Duron
Sheriff's Dept
Riv. Co. Waste
CSA #152

Supervisor Ashley
Commissioner Zuppardo
Riverside Transit Agency
City of Moreno Valley
San Jacinto Unified School Dist.
Eastern Municipal Water Dist.
So. Calif. Edison
Caltrans#8
Caltrans Aeronautics Division - David Cohen
Regional Quality Control Board #8
EIC(Attachment "A")

ADMINISTRATION
RIVERSIDE COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03464 - EA40284 - Applicant: Ramona Duck Club - Engineer/Rep.: Overton Kuhn - Fifth Supervisorial District - Hemet-San Jacinto Zoning District, Lakeview Zoning Area - Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan: Open Space: Conservation (OS-C) - Location: Northerly of Ramona Expressway, southerly of Gilman Springs Road, and easterly of Davis Road - 92.21 Gross Acres - Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R), Heavy Agriculture - 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) - REQUEST: Continued operation as a duck hunting club with ancillary clay target shooting and RV usage for overnight stay. - APNs: 423-040-017, 423-050-008, 025

Please review the case described above, along with the attached tentative map/exhibit **This case is scheduled for a CPR meeting on November 3, 2005**. All County Agencies and Departments, please have draft conditions in the Land Management System by the above date. If you cannot clear the exhibit, please have corrections in the system and DENY the routing. Once the route is complete, and the approval screen is approved with or without corrections, the case can be scheduled for a public hearing. All other agencies, please have your comments/conditions to the Planning Department as soon as possible. Your comments/recommendations/conditions are requested so that they may be incorporated in the staff report for this particular case.

Should you have any questions regarding this item, please do not hesitate to contact **Russell Brady**, Project Planner, at (909) 955-1888.

COMMENTS:

"No Comment"

DATE: 10/18/05

SIGNATURE:

PLEASE PRINT NAME AND TITLE: Deputy Kim Judge

TELEPHONE: (951) 791-3409

If you do not use this letter for your response, please indicate the project planner's name. Thank you

COMPREHENSIVE PROJECT REVIEW
(*INITIAL CASE ACCEPTANCE) COMMENT AGENDA
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

9TH FLOOR, CAC - P.O. Box 1409

Riverside, CA 92502-1409

SCANNED

By: MER

Date: 10/14/05

DATE: October 12, 2005

Transportation
Environmental Health
Flood Control District
Fire Department
Building & Safety (Grading)
Regional Parks & Open Space
Geologist
EPD
Donna Duron
Sheriff's Dept
Riv. Co. Waste
CSA #152

Supervisor Ashley
Commissioner Zuppardo
Riverside Transit Agency
City of Moreno Valley
San Jacinto Unified School Dist.
Eastern Municipal Water Dist.
So. Calif. Edison
Caltrans#8
Caltrans Aeronautics Division - David Cohen
Regional Quality Control Board #8
EIC(Attachment "A")

RECEIVED
NOV 02 2005

ADMINISTRATION
RIVERSIDE COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

05 OCT 14 PM 1:04
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 03464 - EA40284 - Applicant: Ramona Duck Club - Engineer/Rep.: Overton, Kuhn - Fifth Supervisorial District - Hemet-San Jacinto Zoning District, Lakeview Zoning Area - Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan: Open Space: Conservation (OS-C) - Location: Northerly of Ramona Expressway, southerly of Gilman Springs Road, and easterly of Davis Road - 92.21 Gross Acres - Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R), Heavy Agriculture - 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) - REQUEST: Continued operation as a duck hunting club with ancillary clay target shooting and RV usage for overnight stay. - APNs: 423-040-017, 423-050-008, 025

Please review the case described above, along with the attached tentative map/exhibit **This case is scheduled for a CPR meeting on November 3, 2005. All County Agencies and Departments, please have draft conditions in the Land Management System by the above date.** If you cannot clear the exhibit, please have corrections in the system and DENY the routing. Once the route is complete, and the approval screen is approved with or without corrections, the case can be scheduled for a public hearing. All other agencies, please have your comments/conditions to the Planning Department as soon as possible. Your comments/recommendations/conditions are requested so that they may be incorporated in the staff report for this particular case.

Should you have any questions regarding this item, please do not hesitate to contact **Russell Brady**, Project Planner, at (909) 955-1888.

COMMENTS:

NO comment

DATE: 10-31-05 SIGNATURE:

Ron Wymore

PLEASE PRINT NAME AND TITLE: *Ron Wymore, Planner*

TELEPHONE: *951 4863285*

If you do not use this letter for your response, please indicate the project planner's name. Thank you

LAND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
CASE TRANSMITTAL
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT - RIVERSIDE
P.O. Box 1409
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

DATE: March 5, 2008

TO:

Transportation Department, Jim Knutson
Dept. of Environmental Health
Dept. of Flood
Dept. of Fire
Dept. of Bldg. & Safety (Grading)

Environmental Programs Dept.
Regional Parks & Open Space
Co. Geologist
Archeology-Leslie Mouriquand

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 3464, AMENDED NO. 1 – EA40284 – Applicant: Ramona Duck Club – Engineer/Representative: Overtun Kuhn - Fifth Supervisorial District – Hemet-San Jacinto Zoning District, Lakeview Zoning Area – Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan: Open Space: Conservation (OS-C) – Location: Northerly of Ramona Expressway, Southwesterly of Gilman Springs Road, and Easterly of Davis Road – 91.49 Net Acres – Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R), Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) – **REQUEST:** The Conditional Use Permit proposes to legalize and existing operation of a duck hunting club with ancillary clay target shooting, RV usage for overnight stay, an 1,800 square foot clubhouse, and equipment storage containers. – APNs: 423-040-017, 423-050-008, 425-050-025. Related Cases: CUP03375 – Concurrent Cases: N/A

Please review the attached **Amended** exhibit(s) for the above-mentioned project. Any further comments, recommendations, and/or conditions are requested prior to the pending **April 3, 2008 CPR Comment Agenda** deadline, in order that they may be incorporated in the staff report package for this project.

Should you have any questions regarding this item, please do not hesitate to contact **Russell Brady**, Project Planner, (951)955-1888, or e-mail at rbrady@RCTLMA.org / **MAILSTOP #: 1070**

COMMENTS:

FILE COPY

DATE: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

PLEASE PRINT NAME AND TITLE: _____

TELEPHONE: _____

If you do not include this transmittal in your response, please include a reference to the case number and project planner's name. Thank you.

LAND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
3RD CASE TRANSMITTAL
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT - RIVERSIDE
P.O. Box 1409
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

DATE: December 30, 2008

TO

Riv. Co. Transportation Dept.
Riv. Co. Environmental Health Dept.
Riv. Co. Flood Control District

Riv. Co. Fire Dept.
Riv. Co. Dept. of Building & Safety – Grading
Riv. Co. Parks & Open Space District

Riv. Co. Environmental Programs Dept.
P.D.. Geology Section-D. Jones

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 3464 – EA40284 – Applicant: Ramona Duck Club – Engineer/Representative: Overton Kuhn – Reche Canyon / Badlands Area Plan: Open Space: Conservation (OS:C) – Location: Northerly of Marvin Road, southwesterly of Central Avenue, and easterly of Main Street – 2.00 Gross Acres – Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R) and Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) – REQUEST: The Conditional Use Permit proposes the continued operation of a private hunt club that contains Trailer/Recreational Vehicle staging areas for overnight occupancy within 2.00 Gross Acres of a 92.00 acre area that spans three (3) parcels with contiguous ownership. The project consists of eleven (11) eleven existing Trailer/Recreational-Vehicle parking spaces, an existing 96 sq. ft. tool shed, two existing (2) 7,500 gallon water tanks, and is proposing seven (7) Trailer/Recreational Vehicle staging areas, a 600 sq. ft. area for a pre-fabricated clubhouse, a 144 sq. ft. and 2,100 sq. ft. covered storage area, and a covered and fenced “run” for hunting dogs. – APNs: 425-050-025, 423-040-017, and 423-050-008

Please review the attached **Amended** map(s) and/or exhibit(s) for the above-mentioned project. Any further comments, recommendations, and/or conditions are requested prior to the pending **January 22, 2009 LDC Comment Agenda** deadline, in order that they may be incorporated in the staff report package for this project.

Should you have any questions regarding this item, please do not hesitate to contact **Russell Brady, (951) 955-1888**, or e-mail at **rbrady@rctlma.org / MAILSTOP #: 1070**


COMMENTS:

DATE: _____ SIGNATURE: _____

PLEASE PRINT NAME AND TITLE: _____

TELEPHONE: _____

If you do not include this transmittal in your response, please include a reference to the case number and project planner's name. Thank you.



COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY
Environmental Programs Department

Carolyn Syms Luna
Director

May 22, 2007

Mr. Laurence Dean
Brian F. Smith & Associates
14010 Poway Road, Suite A
Poway, CA 92064

Dear Mr. Dean:


Re: EPD Comments for Habitat Assessment Report (PDB04993)
Case Number: CUP03464, HANS01533
Assessor's Parcel Number: 423-040-017, 423-050-008, and 425-050-025

This letter is to inform you that the subject report prepared by your firm has been reviewed by the Environmental Programs Department (EPD) staff for consistency with the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). Attached are comments prepared by EPD staff in accordance with the MSHCP.

If you have any questions concerning your case, please do not hesitate to contact me at (951) 955-8072 or via e-mail at dcarr@rctlma.org.

Sincerely,

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS DEPARTMENT



David W. Carr
Ecological Resources Specialist

DWC
Attachment

xc: Josias Gonzalez, Planning Department
Kelly Hayes, Ramona Duck Club

General Comments

While the report characterized the site well, the items listed below are to be met prior to scheduling the case for public hearing. The existing reports may be amended and/or subsequent revised reports may be submitted to the EPD for review.

Initially, the CUP description included all three APNs. However, based on the report submitted and personal communication with the applicant (Kelly Hayes), it appears the project description/scope has changed. Additional documentation is required concerning the JPR/HANS determination that the entire site be under a conservation easement with the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA). Please provide clarification/background (i.e., RCA Conservation Easement) as to why the entire site was not surveyed (APNs 423-040-017, 423-050-008, and 425-050-025).

Section 6.1.2 Riverine/Riparian, Vernal Pool and Fairy Shrimp Habitats (RRVP)

Provide a specific assessment for fairy shrimp habitat as defined by the MSHCP. Please include documentation (e.g., soil suitability, proximity to known locations, hydrology regime present) to describe how that conclusion determined that the fairy shrimp listed in this section of the MSHCP are absent.

Section 6.1.3 and 6.3.2 Narrow Endemic and Criteria Area Plant Species (NEPS/CAPS)


The report states the site is devoid of vegetation. It appears as though the site is regularly impacted due to human activities (i.e., disking, mowing). Please provide further documentation as to the determination that all NEPS/CAPS are considered absent from the site, as there are suitable soils for many of the plant species and known locations in the vicinity. According to the Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS), the site is mapped as alkali playa, field croplands, and open water/reservoir/pond. The report also identified evidence of accumulated alkaline salts. Many of the NEPS/CAPS are associated with alkali playa habitat and there is reasonable potential for many of them to occur on and around the site. Provide background (e.g., historical/current use of the site) on the deviation from the mapped habitat types and why they would not be considered accurate, lacking the characteristics of vernal plain, play, annual grassland or vernal pool habitat. Include precipitation for the survey year (measured in California from July 1 – June 30) and the affect on the habitat assessment.

Section 6.3.2 Additional Criteria Area Wildlife Species Survey Requirements

It appears that the site lacks suitable burrowing owl habitat due, in part, to ongoing human activities, but a specific statement/evidence needs to be provided. Simply stating that the site is does not support suitable habitat (i.e., disturbed) is not acceptable. At a minimum, it appears a focused burrow survey be conducted (Step 2, Part A).

Other Corrections/Missing Information

- Provide elevation of the site.
- Include a soils map (e.g., The National Resources Conservation Service, <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>). Provide a discussion as to how the soils on-site relate to the soils map (e.g., disturbed, imported fill).



COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Environmental Programs Department

Carolyn Syms Luna
Director

October 16, 2006

Mr. Malcom Smith
Ramona Duck Club
P.O. Box 106
Riverside, CA 92504

Dear Mr. Smith:

Re: JPR 06-09-12-02 Determination Letter- 100% Conservation
HANS No. 1533
Case No: CUP03464
Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 423-050-008, 025 & 423-040-017

This letter is to inform you that the HANS determination for the subject property was forwarded to the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) for Joint Project Review (JPR) pursuant to Section 6.6.2 of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). As stated on the attached "RCA JPR Review", the RCA has concurred with the County that 100% conservation is described for this property (exhibit attached).

The MSHCP contemplates that the RCA will acquire private lands necessary for inclusion in the conservation area. You will be receiving a call from the Environmental Programs Department to see if you are interested in selling your property. If so, we will schedule a HANS II meeting to enter into negotiations with the RCA/EPD. Negotiations for acquisition must be concluded within 120 days.

If you have any questions concerning your HANS case, please contact the EPD at (951) 955-6892. You may also contact the Regional Conservation Authority directly, at (951) 955-9700.

Sincerely,

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS DEPARTMENT

David Carr
Ecological Resources Specialist

DC:mt

xc: Karin Watts-Bazan, Deputy County Counsel
Greg Neal, EPD
Monica Thill, EPD
Ken Graff, RCA
Sarah Lozano, RCA
Kim Tran, Planner

RECEIVED
Environmental Programs Dept.

NOV 16 2006

Western Riverside County
Regional Conservation Authority

October 4, 2006

Mr. David Carr
Environmental Programs Department
County of Riverside
4080 Lemon Street, 2nd Street
Riverside, CA 92501

RE: HANS 1533 / CUP03464
APNs 423-050-008, 423-040-017, 425-050-025
JPR # 06-09-12-02

Dear Mr. Carr,

The RCA has completed review of the above-referenced file regarding MSHCP criteria consistency. We note in the materials provided to the RCA from EPD a letter from Greg Neal, Deputy Director, EPD, of July 28, 2006 to the applicant, Malcolm Smith, advising him of EPD's recommendation for 100% conservation and an indication that the matter would be referred to the RCA for comment. The RCA received a request for project review from EPD on September 12, 2006.

Upon review of the file documents provided by EPD, the RCA hereby states its concurrence with the findings of EPD and agrees that the property should be considered for 100% conservation. Based on discussions with the RCA, County EPD and the applicant, it is our understanding that the discretionary action being considered by the County consists of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) that will allow for continuation of limited duck hunting activities. It is also the RCA's understanding that the conditions to the CUP will include dedication of a conservation easement to the RCA, with terms of the easement to be negotiated, in exchange for allowance and prescribed limitations of the use.

We look forward to continuing the discussions with EPD and the applicant on the details of the conservation easement for the property.

Thank you for your courtesy and cooperation.

Very truly yours,



Joe Monaco
Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority

cc: Greg Neal, Environmental Programs Department
Doreen Stadlander, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Leslie MacNair, California Dept. of Fish and Game

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chairman
Kelly Seyarto
City of Murrieta

Vice Chairman
Jeff Stone
County of Riverside

Marion Ashley
County of Riverside

Robin Lowe
City of Hemet

William Batey
City of Moreno Valley

Dom Betro
City of Riverside

Bob Buster
County of Riverside

Larry Dressel
City of Beaumont

Frank Hall
City of Norco

John Machisic
City of Banning

Eugene Montanez
City of Corona

Shenna Moquet
City of Calimesa

Robert Schiffner
City of Lake Elsinore

Dale Stubblefield
City of San Jacinto

John Tavaglione
County of Riverside

Chuck Washington
City of Temecula

Roy Wilson
County of Riverside

Mark Yarbrough
City of Perris

John Zaitz
City of Canyon Lake

EXECUTIVE STAFF
Tom Mullen
Executive Director

Joseph Richards
Deputy Executive Director

Item
4.2

FRIENDS OF THE NORTHERN SAN JACINTO VALLEY
P.O. 9097
Moreno Valley CA 92552-9097
www.northfriends.org

May 28, 2008

Riverside County Planning Commission

Re: Ramona Duck Club Conditional Use Permit 03464--- CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, Categorical Exemption for Existing Facilities.

Planning Commission:

The Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley have these additional comments to make regarding the above project and accompanying CUP and CEQA document.

- (1) There are not maps of the project description and location. The maps for this project must show the following:
 - a. A detailed site map of the 91.49 acres showing the existing conditions, including but not limited to the vacation RV Park with 20 RV parking spaces; 20 automobile parking spaces; 1 storage container, a portable tool storage shed; and any existing structures which will be removed.
 - b. A detailed site map of the 91.49 acres showing where any new RV parking spaces, automobile parking spaces, storage containers, portable tool storage sheds, the new clubhouse, 3 more storage containers; an agricultural equipment shed, two 500 gallon water storage tanks and restrooms will be located.
 - c. A detailed map of the surrounding area miles, including the nearby MSHCP reserves (19,000 acres San Jacinto Wildlife Area - both the Davis Road and Portrero Units; and the 8,000 acre Lake Perris State Park); the surrounding duck clubs, including but not limited to the Ramona Hunt Club (DFG conservation easement); Mystic Lake Duck Club (DFG conservation easement); 21 gun club (ground currently being disturbed apparently without any permits -county, DFG or RCA).
 - d. The location of the current? New? Clay target shooting area must be mapped. The impacts of lead shot within a wetland must be discussed. Is this permitted under state law?

Presentation slides:

- Slide #2 shows a lot of roads which do not, in fact, exist on the ground. The map fails to identify the location/boundary of the SJWA; the location of Mystic Lake (in which this property is located); or the location of the surrounding duck hunting clubs.
- Slide #3 shows a lot of roads which do not, in fact, exist on the ground. The map fails to identify the location/boundary of the SJWA; the location of Mystic Lake (in which this property is located); or the location of the surrounding duck hunting clubs.
- Slide #4 The map fails to identify the location/boundary of the SJWA; the location of Mystic Lake (in which this property is located); or the location of the surrounding duck hunting clubs.
- Slide #5 The map fails to identify the location/boundary of the SJWA; the location of Mystic Lake (in which this property is located); or the location of the surrounding duck hunting clubs.
- Slide # 6 The map fails to identify the location/boundary of the SJWA; the location of Mystic Lake (in which this property is located); or the location of the surrounding duck hunting clubs.
- Slide # 7 The map fails to identify the significance of slash marks on parcel # 423050005 or 423100014(00373).
- Slide # 8. The Plot plan cannot be read when printed. The numbers are too small and blurry. The plot plan does not differentiate between existing and new construction. The plot plan does not indicate what structures etc. might be removed. For instance, we do

- not believe there are currently 20 8' X 12' concrete pads for trailer parking. The covered and fenced dog run location is not shown.
- None of the slides show the location of the "ancillary clay target shooting facility. What else is missing?

(2) The Wildlife Conservation Board on May 22, 2008 removed from their agenda a proposal to pay the Ramona Duck Club over \$400,000 (four hundred thousand dollars) for a DFG conservation easement on their property. That conservation easement will have different conditions than this conservation easement and CUP. That conservation easement will also require a CEQA document. The FWS has just awarded the California Waterfowl Association a \$1,000,000 (one million) dollar grant under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) for the Southern California Coastal and Inland Wetland Project. This project construction will take place, as far as we have been able to determine from the FWS limited maps and information, on the Ramona Duck which is seeking this CUP, as well as on the adjacent Ramona Hunt Club, the Mystic Duck Club and possibly the 21 gun club) This project also requires a CEQA document. The HANS process also requires a CEQA document. (Fish and Game Code section 2826¹).

The numerous CEQA documents which are required for this site to be developed (the CUP, the HANS conservation easement, the WCB conservation easement, and the NAWCA project) cannot be segmented. Ideally, they should be one document; at least they should all be acknowledged, coordinated and planned so that no MSHCP species, especially plant species, are harmed and that the conditions of approval and mitigation measures are consistent and support, not contradict, each other.

(3) The project does not meet the requirements for an Existing Facilities Exemption from CEQA (Guidelines 15301)

- a. This exemption does not apply because the area in which the project is located is environmentally sensitive. (Guidelines 15301(e) (2) (B). (MSHCP criteria area)
- b. This exemption does not apply because the area in which the project is located may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies. (Guidelines 15300.2(a). (MSHCP criteria area)
- c. This exemption does not apply because the cumulative impacts of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant. (Guidelines 15300.2(b). The adjacent Mystic Duck Club and Ramona Duck Club both have CUP's for and RV facility and both have DFG conservation easements. An RV facility appears to be in the process of being constructed on the 21 gun club, apparently without permits. The cumulative impacts of these four similar facilities physically adjacent to one another must be addressed.
- d. The exemption does not apply because there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. (Guidelines 15300.2 (c)). This facility is located in an MSHCP criteria area, has gone through the HANS process to impose certain conditions. But, most importantly, the MSHCP identifies this area in and around the Mystic Lake bed as home to many plants of special concern, in particular the San Jacinto saltbush, the spreading navarretia and the thread-leaved brodiaea. (see attachment the MSHCP discussion of plants of the san jacinto valley)

(4) The notice of exemption also does not apply as the Conditions of approval show that further studies need to be conducted and approved before this project can be built. Any one of those studies alone trigger the requirement for an initial study to determine whether a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration or an environmental impact report is required.

- a. The project description fails to include the ancillary clay target shooting (10. Every 001 GENERAL CONDITIONS USE-PROJECT DESCRIPTION.) T This use is mentioned once in the conditions of approval, but it is not mapped and no conditions are place on the use of lead shot in a MSHCP wetland area for both wildlife and water quality impacts.

¹ "Nothing in this chapter [Natural Community Conservation Planning Act] exempts a project proposed in a natural communities planning area from Division 13 (commencing with Section 2100) of the Public Resources Code [CEQA] or otherwise alters or affects the applicability of that division." FGC 2826.

- b. The flood control conditions of approval must be met (these are missing) and drainage must be designed to meet 100 year storm flows (this criteria is missing). The grading plan submitted (has been or will be???) to BS must comply with any WQMP (water quality management plan) required by Flood control. (this is missing) An exemption cannot apply when a project must show if and how it can comply with flood control conditions of approval for 100 year storm flows and for WQMP's.
- c. There will apparently be paving. (10.BS GRADE 013 & 10.BS GRADE 018) Asphalt is not consistent with the MSHCP and endangered plants and water quality issues.
- d. A NPDES permit is required. (10.BS GRADING 020) The NPDES permit must be part of the CEQA document.
- e. The conditions leave open the possibility that in the future permanent restroom facilities required water and sewage permits will be allowed under this CUP. (10.E HEALTH 001) An exemption cannot apply to a project which allows future facilities which would require CEQA review, such as permanent restroom facilities.
- f. The project must comply with MSHCP guidelines for urban wildlands interface and construction guidelines. (10.EPD 001). This HANS process itself, is subject to a separate CEQA document prepared by the RCA. In addition, it is not complete as this project is in the lakebed of Mystic Lake and contains wetlands and rare plant habitat, yet the conditions for constructing in and near wetlands and rare plant habitat are not included. Nowhere does the CUP name or map the SJWA or duck club conservation easements on which this property would impact.
- g. The flood hazard report is the only place where the *ancillary clay target shooting* is mentioned. An additional unnamed structure within the flood way is mentioned as being "unacceptable", but it is not identified and there is no recommendation that it be removed.
- h. Any RV's which are not "temporary" require floodproofing and new permanent RV's and structures are unacceptable. (10.FLOODCONTROL RI 003 & 10.FLOOD RI 004). The CEQA document needs to make clear how many permanent RV's and structures are now on the site and how the proposed new clubhouse, storage containers agricultural equipment shed, water storage tanks are not "permanent" structures.
- i. "As this entitlement does not contemplate structures for human occupancy, no geologic study is required at this time." (10.PLANNING 040) The clubhouse and the 20 RV sites are meant for human occupancy and therefore a comprehensive geological report is required. An exemption does not apply to this project. An initial study determining which kind of CEQA document must be prepared is required.
- j. Was there an archaeological report and/or environmental assessment conducted prior to project approval? Where is this document? (10.PLANNING 042)
- k. There is no "Approved Exhibit A" (10.PLANNING 043) is this a list of codes with which compliance is required.
- l. Outside lighting shall be hooded and directed not to shine directly on adjoining property and Mt. Palomar lighting requirements (10. planning 045 & 1 Planning 072) No mention is made of "dark skies" and the impacts of lighting affecting the MSHCP species.
- m. There is no Approved Exhibit B (colors and materials?) (10. PLANNING 046)
- n. Drought tolerant and native species shall be preferred. (10.PLANNING 055) any and all species, native or not, which adversely impact the rare plants in and around mystic lake should be approved on a case by case basis in conjunction with a CEQA document addressing the mitigation measures to be implemented.
- o. Exterior noise levels shall be limited to 45 db. (10, PLANNING 063) The impacts of noise on MSHCP species must be analyzed in the CEQA document.
- p. Every person conducting a business shall obtain a business license. (10. PLANNING 079) Is the Duck Club considered a business, why not? Do they have a license?
- q. Landscaping shall be watered etc. (10. PLANNING 080 & 10. PLANNING 081) All landscaping shall be in conformance with the MSHCP impacts on sensitive plant species and should not need watering.
- r. Recreational vehicles shall be in a roadworthy condition. (10. PLANNING 082) Does this only applies to new RV's brought onto the site, or to the RV's already on the site?
- s. Street improvements (10. Trans 005) what new roads and street improvements will be built? Where is a map showing these improvements? Where are the dedication documents for the street improvements? This exhibit is missing.
- t. Assessment/benefit districts (10. Trans 006) are there any assessment /benefit districts affecting this property?

- u. Hours of operation (20. planning 003) have any hours of operation be set for this project? What are they?
- v. Existing buildings in compliance with county code. (20. PLANNING 006) How can the county approve a CUP for existing structures when it is not know whether the existing structures are in compliance with county codes?
- w. Grading in excess of 199 cubic yards will require performance security (60.BS GRADE 001) How many cubic yards of grading is proposed by this project? This implies that there are not limits on how many cubic yards can be moved either on the RV site or on the conservation easement.
- x. Geotechnical soils reports submitted prior to grading permit (60.BS GRADE 003) This leaves completely open the question of how much grading will be permitted on the RV site and on the RCA easement. The geotechnical/soils, compaction and inspection reports must be part of the CEQA document.
- y. 100 year storm flows and WQMP (60.BS GRADE 004) if grading which required these permits is contemplated, it should be part of the CEQA document.
- z. Letter of permission from easement holders. (60. BS GRADE 007) Any grading on the RCA easement would not only require RCA permission, but also CEQA review for public review. This relates to the NAWCA grant construction on the site.
- aa. NPDES AND SWPPP (60. BS GRADE 009) The NPDES AND THE SWPPP must be part of the CEQA document.
- bb. Import/export of soils (60.BS GRADE 010) As the sensitive plants in and around Mystic Lake are endemic to soils found in the San Jacinto Valley, import and export of soils should be prohibited.
- cc. HANS Conservation Easement (60. EPD 001) The HANS process and the Conservation Easement are independent discretionary actions requiring CEQA review by RCA. The conditions contain statement which make no sense: "prohibit grading or any other disturbance or modification of the property.... and *detention basins* and shall be shall be in a form acceptable to RCA." This is a duck club; it has duck ponds, not detention basins. Does this mean that the club may not modify or improve its duck ponds in any way? What impact does this have on the NAWCA grant as applied to this duck club?
- dd. Geological studies prior to grading permits (60. PLANNING 019) This geological study must be part of the CEQA document.
- ee. HANS Conservation Easement (80. EPD 001) The HANS process and the Conservation Easement are independent discretionary actions requiring CEQA review by RCA. The conditions contain statement which make no sense: "prohibit grading or any other disturbance or modification of the property.... and *detention basins* and shall be shall be in a form acceptable to RCA." This is a duck club; it has duck ponds, not detention basins. Does this mean that the club may not modify or improve its duck ponds in any way? What impact does this have on the NAWCA grant as applied to this duck club?
- ff. Structures for human occupancy require geological studies (80. PLANNING 045) The geological studies need to be part of the CEQA document as the RV's and the clubhouse are structures all meant for human occupancy.
- gg. Approved Exhibit B is not attached (80. PLANNING 048)
- hh. Roof mounted equipment (80. PLANNING 050) roof mounted equipment shall be prohibited unless proven not to be a danger to raptors or other MSHCP species.
- ii. School impacts (80. PLANNING 062) All other residents on Davis Road are part of the Nuevo/ Lakeview school district, as we understand?
- jj. Lighting plans (80. PLANNING 065) All lighting plans must avoid all impacts to the MSHCP species.
- kk. Landscape plot plan (80.PLANNING 068) All landscaping shall be consistent with the MSHCP and shall enhance, not harm, sensitive plant species.
- ll. Paving inspections (90.BS GRADE 001) Where is paving to take place? There should be none!
- mm. Utilities underground (90. PLANNING 011) any change in utilities to underground need to be based on impacts to raptors and electrocution of raptors (which is not an unusual occurrence in the San Jacinto Valley)

The Friends request to be informed of all actions, including but not limited to any notice of determination on CEQA documents, regarding this project at the above address.

Susan L. Nash
Board member

Dear Riverside Co.

re: CUP 03464 and Hans 1533

May 28th
(item 4.2)

A letter dated Nov 9th, 2006 to all Ramona Duck Club members suggests the following activities on site:

Relocate power lines

motorized Boats

year round camping

rebuild all ponds and dikes - and create 4 new ponds.

off-road vehicle use on property year round.

Change names to Ramona Duck Club and R.V. Park

While the above haven't been included in the CUP they haven't been conditioned on these issues or prohibited and this raises many issues to the Sierra Club.

A letter dated Oct 4, 2006 Joe Monaco to Mr. Carr and A letter dated Oct 16, 2006 from David Carr to Malcolm Smith both strongly recommend 100% conservation for this property. What happened to the 100% conservation?

The biological assessment was made on a single day - 19 March 2006 - with the report written one year later on March 28, 2007. On May 22, 2007 David W. Carr wrote to Laurence Dean the author

of the biological habitat assessment, listing several short comings with that report. The letter indicated that these issues needed to be resolved "prior to scheduling the case for public hearing." The Sierra Club could not find where all of these short comings have been addressed prior to this public hearing.

The Sierra Club is turning all these letters in today for the Public Records. As in our previous letter the Sierra Club does not believe the CEQA categorical exemption applies to this project nor is it MSACP compliant. The planning commission should require an initial study on this project. Please keep the Sierra Club informed on all future hearings and documents related to all acres within this project, by using the address below.

Sincerely

George Nagler
Sierra Club
Moreno Valley

Group Conservation Chair

26711 Ironwood Hill

Moreno Valley, Ca. 92555

957-924-0816



SAN GORGONIO CHAPTER

4079 Mission Inn Avenue
Riverside, CA 92501
(951) 684-6203 Fax (951) 684-6172
Membership/Outings (951) 686-6112

*Regional Groups Serving Riverside and San Bernardino Counties:
Big Bear, Los Serranos, Mojave, Moreno Valley, Mountains, Tahquitz*

Mr. Russell Brady
Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor
Riverside, California 92502

May 18, 2008

Dear Mr. Brady:

Re: CUP 03464 Proposed Private Hunting Club

The Sierra Club appreciates the information you provided to allow us to comment on this CUP.

In our opinion Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines does not apply to this project. This proposal is much more than a "minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities, mechanical equipment or topographical features, involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of the lead agency's determination." Please consider some of the following reasons:

- Double trailer and cement pads (increasing from 10 to 20)
- Extension of water hook-ups
- Electrical hook-ups
- Portable restrooms
- 12'x18' screened-in porch with water hook-ups
- Four 10'x40' cargo containers
- Possible septic tanks
- Clubhouse
- Covered and fenced run for dogs
- 15,000 gallon water tank

Any number of the above additions to the existing uses would disqualify it for an exemption. Other concerns that must be fully investigated and evaluated are as follows:

- How will garbage be taken care of – especially the remains from the use of their 12'x12' cleaning room?
- The lighting would be the first allowed in the Mystic Lake bed, and it could have an effect on several species.
- How will the 15,000-gallon water tank be hidden or made less noticeable?
- How will you do the same with the four 40' trailers? Twenty years from now, how will they be maintained?
- Will increasing well water use impact ground water availability over the life of the project? When will overdrafting occur?
- Lead shot will probably be used at the skeet and target facility, and that entails toxic impacts on the lakebed, downstream water resources and several different species.
- What permitted uses could impact the multi-species responsibilities of the adjacent San Jacinto Wildlife Area?

- How could the CUP prejudice either RCA or CDF&G conservation easements?
- How will the recently approved NAWCA grant impact these acres?
- Will the public be receiving conservation easements on the existing lands or on the lands changed by the NAWCA grant? What will those changes be? What will these acres look like if the proposed CUP and NAWCA grant are built out?
- Which threatened or endangered species, or species covered by the Riverside County Multi-species Plan, use these acres or could do so with proper land management? Would farming activities interfere with any of these species?
- How will you condition the perimeter fence to be the least restrictive for animal movement? Chain link would be a crime.
- What are the Army Corps of Engineer comments on building in a flood zone? Will the 20 cement pads, 4 storage units, and other structures cause the floodwaters to inundate lands that otherwise would be out of the flood zone? Where are those lands? These lands are also within the Hemet Dam inundation area.
- How will wastewater be handled? What impacts will be caused by the water run-off from all the structures and equipment?
- How will all the structures and human activity affect water quality of the San Jacinto River, of which Mystic Lake is a part?
- How will septic systems impact all of the Sierra Club's concerns listed above, whether in or out of a flood zone?
- When a conservation easement is finalized, will the Rural Residential zoning be eliminated?
- Are you certain these lands are in the Moreno Valley sphere of influence?
- Any and all maps must clearly show the San Jacinto Wildlife Area and acknowledge that it is a cornerstone reserve for our MSHCP.
- There needs to be information on HANS 1533 and a map showing which 86+ acres are required for conservation.
- Which geotechnical problems (subsidence and fissures, for example) could affect the different structures?
- What are the growth-inducing and cumulative impacts of this proposed project?

Please keep the Sierra Club informed of all documents and meetings by sending notices to the address below. Any future action or decision related to these lands must be sent, including any renewals of the CUP.

Sincerely,

George Hague
 Conservation Chair
 Moreno Valley Group of the Sierra Club
 26711 Ironwood Avenue
 Moreno Valley, California 92555-1906
 Phone: 951-924-0816
 Fax: 951-924-4185

From: Russell Brady
To: hague, george
Date: 5/27/2008 4:49 PM
Subject: Re: sierra club CUP 03464

I apologize for the delay on this. It just took a long time to compile all of the answers and to confirm that I was providing accurate information.

Regarding the CEQA exemption, it is the opinion of staff that the project does qualify for an exemption pursuant to section 15301 of CEQA. None of the expansions proposed by the project exceed the thresholds listed in section 15301.

All garbage, including animal remains, will be removed from the site by Club members. No garbage pick-up to the site is proposed.

An existing exterior light located on top of a 20' wooden pole illuminates the electrical box near the well. As part of the HANS review for the project, the Environmental Programs Department imposed the following lighting conditions: (i) direct night lighting away from the MSHCP Conservation Areas or Public /Quasi-Public Lands, and (ii) incorporate shielded lighting into the project design to ensure ambient lighting in the MSHCP Conservation Areas and/or Public/Quasi-Public Lands does not increase. To comply with these conditions, a shield will be installed on the existing light fixture to direct the light away from the MSHCP Conservation Areas. Each trailer located on the site may have 1 small exterior light at the door to illuminate the steps.

The approximate height of the storage tank of 20', although higher than any of the other proposed structures on the site by approximately 10', is still comparable to the other structures existing and proposed on the site. In addition, it does fall within the maximum structure height of 50' allowed in the A-2 zone. It is possible that a certain paint color could be required on the tank to minimize its impact, but that is a decision for the Planning Commission.

The proposed 40' storage containers (not trailers) do not require any real short term or long term maintenance. Similar to the water tanks, any requirement to paint or further camouflage the containers would be a decision for the Planning Commission.

The property contains an existing well that has been in use in connection with hunting on the property for over 50 years. In addition, reclaimed water has recently been made available to the site. Club members also bring filtered drinking water to the site for consumption during hunting activities. The Club will use the reclaimed water to support and enhance the wetlands in the conservation area, and will use water from the existing well for back-up only. The use of reclaimed water will reduce the consumption of well water on the site.

The amount of lead shot anticipated is not expected to have any significant impact on any species. The size of shot typically is too large to allow for any leeching into water or soil that would then create a significant impact. In addition, this issue is more closely regulated by CDF&G.

None of the anticipated uses associated with the hunt club would be inconsistent with the MSHCP, particularly the San Jacinto Wildlife Area.

There will not be any conflict with CUP and the RCA and/or CDF&G conservation easements. The approval of the CUP at this time has no bearing on the easements and would in fact expedite the creation of a conservation easement with RCA since it is a condition of approval on this project.

I am not aware of a NAWCA grant. The project as proposed is for private use of the site by the hunt club. I would think that any public use of the site would present serious safety issues.

The biological study prepared for HANS for this project did not identify any threatened or endangered species on site.

There are no specific requirements or restrictions for fencing surrounding the project site. EPD has conditioned the project to comply with UWIG requirements which restrict fencing from being located within a conservation area. Additionally, this area does not function as a wildlife corridor, so fencing really is not an issue to provide for movement between properties. Perimeter fencing would most likely consist of chain link or rail fencing.

The Flood Control District reviews projects flood hazard impacts and they have determined that the project would not create any hazards downstream and that the structures proposed would be allowed in the flood zone.

Wastewater from the restrooms will be contained in tanks on each trailer and transported via truck offsite. Any water drainage from the site and its proposed use is not anticipated to contain any significant pollutants that would drain offsite.

The project is not anticipated to contain uses that would create pollutants that would significantly impact water quality.

Septic systems are not proposed on the site and are prohibited since the site is located within a 100 year flood plain. The trailer sewage will be contained with the trailers and pumped out and carried offsite by truck for proper disposal.

The zoning will remain as is.

According to our GIS system the site is located just inside the sphere of influence of Moreno Valley.

There was no need by the EPD to require a special map showing the project's location in relation to the San Jacinto Wildlife Area.

All records of HANS 1533, including the required conservation area, are available with EPD.

The project's northern end does lie within an identified fault zone. None of the proposed structures are located within the setback area from the fault. The project is located in an area susceptible to subsidence and liquefaction. Since no permanent buildings are proposed, no impacts associated with these hazards are anticipated.

The project is not providing any substantial new infrastructure that would provide additional services to the area that could be considered growth inducing. The impacts of this site are so low, even when considered with the few other projects in this area, to be considered cumulative impacts.

Russell Brady
Contract Planner
Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor
Riverside, CA 92502-1409
p (951) 955-1888
f (951) 955-3157

>>> george hague <gbhague@gmail.com> 5/19/2008 8:18 PM >>>
Will the questions from the Sierra Club and the Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley be answered before the planning commission meeting or are you going to include the letters with the staff report that is already written with many of the concerns of both groups not addresses? Since this conservation easement has been postponed at the state level, why not postpone this issue locally until all concerns are addressed?

thank you again for getting back to me,

George Hague

On May 19, 2008, at 3:18 PM, Russell Brady wrote:

> Thank you. I will make sure this is received by the Planning
> Commission.
>
>>>> george hague <gbhague@gmail.com> 5/19/2008 3:11 PM >>>>
>
> Mr. Brady,
>
> These are the Sierra Club comments on CUP 03464. Please let me know
> you have received them and that they will be shared.
>
> George Hague
>
>

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY

George A. Johnson · Agency Director

Planning Department

Ron Goldman · Planning Director

Memorandum

DATE: September 30, 2009
TO: Planning Commissioners
FROM: Jeff Childers, Urban/Regional Planner IV
RE: **Conditional Use Permit No. 3464 – Agenda Item No. 6.6**

Attached are two letters in support of the project and one letter in opposition. Also, attached is a full sized exhibit that shows the trap and skeet range as proposed on the site. Additionally, there is an email regarding hunting as a right and that this use permit is only for the operation of the hunting club, not for hunting..

Childers, Jeffery

From: Alicen Wong [Alicen.Wong@greshamsavage.com]
Sent: Monday, October 06, 2008 2:59 PM
To: William Gallup
Subject: FW: FW: Ramona Duck Club

Bill - The Department asked Malcolm Smith and Kelly Hayes to get something in writing from Riverside County confirming that hunting is a permitted use on the Ramona Duck Club property. Apparently, during a phone call several months ago, the County Planners told the Department that hunting required a CUP. Upon closer inspection, the Planners determined that operating a hunt club requires a CUP but hunting is a permitted use.

If possible, could you follow up with Nancy or John Donnelly's staff, and confirm that the Department is satisfied with the e-mail below? Thanks. Alicen Wong

-----Original Message-----

From: Nancy Templeton [mailto:NTempleton@dfg.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 03, 2008 8:42 AM
To: Alicen Wong
Cc: William Gallup
Subject: Re: FW: Ramona Duck Club

Alicen,
I received your message.
Thank you,
Nancy

>>> "Alicen Wong" <Alicen.Wong@greshamsavage.com> 10/2/2008 3:18 PM >>>

GRESHAMSAVAGE

<<http://www.greshamsavage.com/>>

Alicen Wong

Gresham Savage Nolan & Tilden

A Professional Corporation

550 East Hospitality Lane, Suite 300

San Bernardino, CA 92408-4205

Phone: (909) 890-4499

Fax: (909) 890-2511

Alicen.Wong@greshamsavage.com

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: This electronic message contains information from the law firm of Gresham Savage Nolan & Tilden, a Professional Corporation, and may be confidential or privileged. The information is intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this message is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by telephone at (909) 890-4499 or by e-mail reply and delete this message. Thank you.

From: Alicen Wong
Sent: Thursday, October 02, 2008 3:18 PM
To: 'ntempleton@dfg.gov'
Subject: FW: Ramona Duck Club

Nancy - About 1 month ago, the Department of Conservation spoke with Russell Brady, Planner, at the County of Riverside. Although I did not participate in the call, I understand Mr. Brady advised the Department that a CUP is required to hunt on the subject property. When I asked Mr. Brady about this statement, he said he told the Department that the operation of a hunt club requires a CUP.

I understand the Department has asked for confirmation re: whether or not hunting is a permitted use on the property. The e-mail below is intended to set the record straight in that regard. Please call me to discuss. Thank you. Alicen Wong

From: Brady, Russell [<mailto:RBRADY@rctlma.org>]
Sent: Thursday, October 02, 2008 2:52 PM
To: ntempleton@dfg.gov
Cc: Alicen Wong; Neal, Greg; Baez, Ken; Rush, Adam
Subject: RE: Ramona Duck Club

Hunting is an allowed use not requiring a land use permit on these subject properties. It is the operation of a hunting club that requires a land use permit, which is what the current CUP in process is proposing on a small portion (approx. 1.9 acres) of these properties.

Russell Brady

Contract Planner

Riverside County Planning Department

4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor

Riverside, CA 92502-1409

p (951) 955-1888

f (951) 955-3157

From: Alicen Wong [<mailto:Alicen.Wong@greshamsavage.com>]
Sent: Thursday, October 02, 2008 2:40 PM
To: Brady, Russell
Subject: Ramona Duck Club

Russell - The Department of Conservation has asked for confirmation from the County that hunting is a permitted use on the 91.49-acre property in akeview known as APN 423-040-017, 423-050-008, 425-050-025. Please reply directly to: ntempleton@dfg.gov, with a cc to me. Thank you.
Alicen Wong

GRESHAMSAVAGE

www.greshamsavage.com <<http://www.greshamsavage.com/>>

Alicen Wong
Gresham Savage Nolan & Tilden
A Professional Corporation
550 East Hospitality Lane, Suite 300
San Bernardino, CA 92408-4205

(Phone: (909) 890-4499 Ext. 1811
(Direct Line:(909) 723-1811
(Cellular: (909) 215-8112
+ Fax: (909) 890-2511
* Alicen.Wong@greshamsavage.com

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: This electronic message contains information from the law firm of Gresham Savage Nolan & Tilden, a Professional Corporation, and may be confidential or privileged. The information is intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this message is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by telephone at (909) 890-4499 or by e-mail reply and delete this message. Thank you.



April 28, 2009

Planning Commissioners
County of Riverside
P.O. Box 1070
Riverside, CA 92502-1090

RE: CUP 03464 for Ramona Duck Club

Dear Planning Commission Members:

On behalf of California Waterfowl Association, I ask the County to support CUP 03464, and the Ramona Duck Club, in its request for approval of a trailer-parking area next to its hunt club. California Waterfowl is a charitable 501(c)(3) organization dedicated to conserving California's waterfowl, wetlands, and outdoor heritage, representing the interests of over 21,000 members statewide.

As you know, wetland areas rarely occur in Southern California due to the arid conditions, the high cost of water, and recent water shortages. The cost of water alone can be prohibitive in many instances. In this case, however, Mutual Water has made recycled water available to the property. In addition, due to the compatibility of duck hunting and open space uses, approval of CUP 03464 will foster the conservation of wetlands by providing access and lodging for hunters near the duck hunting area. The duck club operation, in turn, will facilitate the management, maintenance and enhancement of a large wetlands area.

California Waterfowl cannot accomplish the state and federal goals of wetland restoration and management without assistance from private landowners. When the County approves projects that are compatible with wetlands conservation, such as CUP 03463, everyone benefits. Please support wetland conservation and duck hunting, a land use that is compatible with open space preservation, by recommending the approval of CUP 03464.

Sincerely,

Gregory S. Yarris
Director of Conservation Policy

cc: Jeff Childers (via -mail: jchilder@rctlma.org)
Malcom Smith (via email: mtsdrywall@aol.com)

Members:



Buckshot
Retrievers

Lower Sherman
Island
Duck Hunters
Association

National Open
Field Coursing
Association

May 4, 2009

Planning Commission
County of Riverside
P.O. Box 1070
Riverside, CA 92502-1090

RE: CUP 03464 for Ramona Duck Club

Dear Planning Commission Members:

The California Outdoor Heritage Alliance (COHA), a nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting wildlife conservation and protecting our hunting heritage supports CUP 03464, which would allow the Ramona Duck Club to establish a trailer parking area adjacent to its waterfowl hunting club.

With over 90% of California's historic wetlands destroyed, it is imperative that incentives are provided to landowners to protect or restore wetlands on their property. Southern California, in particular, suffers from an extreme shortage of wetland habitat primarily due to the arid conditions, high cost of water, and continued urbanization. Fortunately, the Ramona Duck Club has secured reliable and affordable recycled water from Mutual Water. In addition, due to the compatibility of duck hunting and open space uses, the approval of CUP 03464 will further promote the conservation of waterfowl and wetlands by providing access and lodging for hunters near the hunting area. The Ramona Duck Club, in turn, will facilitate the management, maintenance and enhancement of critically important wetlands.

By supporting the CUP 03464, Riverside County will uphold its commitment to wetland conservation and open space preservation while allowing compatible uses. For these reasons, COHA strongly encourages the Planning Commission to support CUP 03464.

Sincerely,

Jason Rhine, Director of Advocacy
California Outdoor Heritage Alliance

FRIENDS OF THE NORTHERN SAN JACINTO VALLEY
P.O. Box 9097
Moreno Valley, CA 92552-9097
www.northfriends.org

29 September 2009

Via e-mail: CGRIFFIN@RCTLMA.ORG

Riverside County Planning Commission
Riverside County Administrative Center
4080 Lemon Street
Riverside, CA 92502

Dear Riverside County Planning Commission Members:

Re: Ramona Duck Club Conditional Use Permit 3464, September 30, 2009 Agenda Item

In May 2008 the Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley objected to the approval of Conditional Use Permit 3464 (CUP 3464) under a Categorical Exemption pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). We are once again protesting the continuing faulty implementation of California Environmental Quality Act by the Riverside County Planning Commission.

The Planning Department is now proposing that the project be approved by the Planning Commission based on a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). The Friends became aware of the Planning Department's ongoing faulty review of this project upon reviewing the entire file for CUP 3464. The Planning Commission should recognize that the MND recommended for this project has not been prepared nor does it exist. More importantly the MND, identified only in the CEQA Initial Study, has not been subject to public or State Clearinghouse (SCH) review. Consequently, the Planning Commission is now considering the approval of CUP 3464 without the required CEQA document and the necessary public and SCH review. The Planning Commission consideration of the project is therefore contrary to the requirements of the law (CEQA Guideline 15004; RiverWatch, 170 Cal App.4th pp.1205-1206).

As part of your review of CUP 3464, it should be pointed out that none of the maps in the Planning Department staff presentation outline the adjacent San Jacinto Wildlife Area public lands. The San Jacinto Wildlife Area (SJWA) is 19,000 acres of wildlife habitat managed by the state Department of Fish and Game. The lands are partial mitigation for the loss of wildlife habitat when the State Water Project was built. It is a Stephens' kangaroo rat reserve for the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency. It is a cornerstone reserve in the Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The wildlife area needs to be delineated on all maps used in this presentation and within any environmental documents related to this CUP.

The Friends are concerned that the project description remains cursory in order to avoid an examination of the full extent of the project impacts. The proposal continues to propose a trap and skeet range. It is not clear whether or not the trap and skeet range will be open for use by the general public (there is a provision for 20 automobile parking spaces). The Initial Study prepared by the Planning Department staff indicates that the Hunt Club will provide by-laws to restrain the use of lead shot on the shooting range. The Friends believe this proposed mitigation measure is merely a concession to the project proponent. It will not be effective or enforceable by the county and is not commensurate with the seriousness of the discharge of lead at this sensitive location. The Planning Commission also needs to consider the effect of lead pollution on the downstream users (Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore) of the San Jacinto River. We have attached a copy of The Wildlife Society

position statement on the use of lead ammunition for consideration by the Planning Commission and request it be included in the administrative record for CUP 3464.


The Friends also believe it imperative that the CEQA document for this project examine whether or not a trap and skeet range with its high intensity noise will be a detriment to wildlife use of the MSHCP lands surrounding the project site. It makes little sense for the State of California and the County of Riverside to spend millions of public dollars acquiring wildlife conservation lands and then approve conflicting uses within those conservation lands.

Since our testimony in May 2008, the Friends have become aware that the project applicant (Ramona Duck Club) is inappropriately blocking the access to public lands which comprise the San Jacinto Wildlife Area. Attached are recent photographs of the project proponent's newly constructed iron-gate which is preventing the public from accessing hundreds of acres of public lands on the SJWA (APN: 425050024, 425050004, 423040015, 423040019). The project applicant's blockade of public access to these existing regional conservation/recreational lands is a significant project impact, and it warrants resolution in the CEQA document. The Friends are concerned that if the project proponent is allowed to prevent public access to these public lands it will constitute a gift of these lands to the project applicant.

The Friends are requesting that the Planning Commission defer the approval of CUP 3464 pending the preparation and public review of the appropriate CEQA document for this project.

Thank you for considering our comments. Please notify us of all documents, meetings, and other materials pertinent to this project.


Sincerely,



Ann L. Turner-McKibben, President
(951) 924-8150
e-mail: northfriends@northfriends.org

Attachments:

Lead in Ammunition and Fishing Tackle: Final Position Statement, The Wildlife Society, Bethesda, MD, July 2009.
Photographs (2), Ramona Hunt Club Entrance Gate, September 2009.



THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY

5410 Grosvenor Lane • Bethesda, MD 20814-2144

Tel: (301) 897-9770 • Fax: (301) 530-2471

E-mail: twswildlife.org

Final Position Statement

Lead in Ammunition and Fishing Tackle

Lead has been used in ammunition and fishing tackle for centuries. It is an effective and inexpensive element for the manufacture of projectiles and weights. Although it is a naturally occurring element in the environment, lead has no functional or beneficial role in biological systems, and at very low levels of exposure it can be toxic, depending on the species and the health and age of an individual. At toxic levels lead damages the nervous system, causing paralysis and eventual death; at lower levels it is known to cause a variety of sublethal effects such as neurological damage, tissue and organ damage, and reproductive impairment.

Realization of the hazards of lead ammunition to waterfowl and some upland game birds can be traced to the late 1870s, while the hazards of lead fishing sinkers to waterfowl became apparent in the 1970s, when lead was found to poison swans in the United Kingdom (UK). In the 1970s and 1980s, the UK and some jurisdictions within the United States and Canada began placing restrictions on the use of lead ammunition and fishing tackle. Today lead from ammunition and fishing tackle provides a small fraction of total environmental releases, but it exists in a form that can be readily ingested by some species of wildlife.

Metallic lead can remain relatively stable and intact for decades, even centuries. However, under certain environmental conditions (e.g., acidic or basic water or soil) lead from shot or tackle can be readily released and taken up by plants or animals, causing a range of biochemical, physiological, and behavioral effects in some species of invertebrates, fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals. Lead that is adsorbed or incorporated into food items through the soil, as well as lead fragments in carcasses or deposited at shooting sites, is known to be consumed by some birds and small mammals, resulting in elevated lead concentrations. Ingestion by reptiles, birds, and mammals of spent ammunition and lost fishing tackle has also been documented and can cause a range of negative effects in individuals, potentially leading to population-level consequences in some species (e.g., waterfowl, eagles, condors, mourning doves, and loons).

From a public health perspective, lead potentially can lead to a variety of human health problems, such as neurological effects and stunted growth, particularly in children. Although the extent is still unclear, recent research indicates that consumption of game taken with lead ammunition may increase blood-lead levels in humans. When lead that is imbedded in game meat becomes exposed to acid in the human stomach, lead may be absorbed into the system. Even if a lead pellet or bullet completely passes through an animal, a small amount of lead may be left in the tissue and may be absorbed by a person consuming the meat.

Lead poisoning related to spent ammunition and lost fishing tackle has been extensively studied in birds, and at least two studies indicate that the ban on the use of lead ammunition for hunting

waterfowl and coots in North America has successfully reduced lead exposure in waterfowl. Nonetheless, other species such as upland game birds (e.g., doves and quail) and scavengers (e.g., vultures and eagles) have been documented to be exposed to lead, and the California condor population may be at risk. Despite the prohibition on lead shot for waterfowl hunting, current data for raptors and avian scavengers indicate increases in lead exposure in these species, especially during hunting season. Accordingly, 24 states (as of 2008) have instituted restrictions on the use of lead ammunition to minimize effects to upland game birds, eagles, and other species. The hazard of ingested lead sinkers and fishing tackle is well-documented in swans and loons, and restrictions on the sale or use of lead weights have been instituted in parts of the UK, Canada, several other countries, and five states in the U.S. (as of 2008) in order to minimize effects on these and other potentially vulnerable species. There are only limited data on the adverse effects of lead ingestion at shooting ranges, and reproductive and mortality rates at these sites have not been adequately investigated.

There has been an extensive effort in the development, efficacy testing, and regulation of alternatives to lead-based ammunition for hunting waterfowl and waterbirds. Several effective nontoxic alternatives have been approved and currently are available in North America and elsewhere. Several manufacturers have developed nontoxic ammunition that can be used safely in all gauges of modern shotguns, as well as nontoxic rifle bullets for hunting large game. However, the widespread manufacture of this shotgun and rifle ammunition depends on assured markets provided by regulation and enforcement. Nontoxic shot may be used in all clay target sports and currently is required by some shooting facilities. Dozens of substitutes for lead fishing tackle have entered the marketplace in recent years. A few, but not all, alternative metals in fishing tackle have been deemed safe if ingested by waterfowl and some other birds and mammals.

The policy of The Wildlife Society in regard to lead in ammunition and fishing tackle is to:

1. Recognize that lead has been known for centuries to be a broad-spectrum toxicant to humans and wildlife.
2. Advocate the replacement of lead-based ammunition and fishing tackle with nontoxic products, while recognizing that complete replacement may not be possible in specific circumstances.
3. Recognize that the removal of lead for hunting, fishing, and shooting will require collaboration among affected stakeholders (including wildlife professionals, ammunition and tackle manufacturers, sportsmen, policymakers, and the public). It may require a phased-in approach, and will require explicit and targeted educational strategies at both the national and international levels, thereby acknowledging and supporting the crucial role that hunters and anglers play in wildlife management and conservation.
4. Encourage studies on reducing barriers to the development of nontoxic ammunition and fishing tackle, additional research that generates toxicological and environmental chemistry data, monitoring and modeling of exposure effects, and studies predicting consequences of exposure and long-term population-level effects. The need for additional

information, however, should not delay the educational efforts and the phasing-in of nontoxic ammunition and tackle where practicable.

5. Support educational efforts to promote greater public awareness and understanding of the consequences of lead exposure to wildlife populations, and emphasize the potential gains for wildlife and environmental quality from use of nontoxic ammunition and fishing tackle.

Approved by Council July 2009. Expires July 2014.



NO TRESPASSING

WILSON'S BUREAU

1000 W. 10TH ST. S.W.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

TEL. 4-2100

WILSON'S BUREAU

1000 W. 10TH ST. S.W.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

FRIENDS OF THE NORTHERN SAN JACINTO VALLEY
P.O. Box 9097
Moreno Valley, CA 92552-9097
www.northfriends.org

29 September 2009

Via e-mail: CGRIFFIN@RCTLMA.ORG

Riverside County Planning Commission
Riverside County Administrative Center
4080 Lemon Street
Riverside, CA 92502

Dear Riverside County Planning Commission Members:

Re: Ramona Duck Club Conditional Use Permit 3464, September 30, 2009 Agenda Item

In May 2008 the Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley objected to the approval of Conditional Use Permit 3464 (CUP 3464) under a Categorical Exemption pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). We are once again protesting the continuing faulty implementation of California Environmental Quality Act by the Riverside County Planning Commission.

The Planning Department is now proposing that the project be approved by the Planning Commission based on a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). The Friends became aware of the Planning Department's ongoing faulty review of this project upon reviewing the entire file for CUP 3464. The Planning Commission should recognize that the MND recommended for this project has not been prepared nor does it exist. More importantly the MND, identified only in the CEQA Initial Study, has not been subject to public or State Clearinghouse (SCH) review. Consequently, the Planning Commission is now considering the approval of CUP 3464 without the required CEQA document and the necessary public and SCH review. The Planning Commission consideration of the project is therefore contrary to the requirements of the law (CEQA Guideline 15004; RiverWatch, 170 Cal App.4th pp.1205-1206).

As part of your review of CUP 3464, it should be pointed out that none of the maps in the Planning Department staff presentation outline the adjacent San Jacinto Wildlife Area public lands. The San Jacinto Wildlife Area (SJWA) is 19,000 acres of wildlife habitat managed by the state Department of Fish and Game. The lands are partial mitigation for the loss of wildlife habitat when the State Water Project was built. It is a Stephens' kangaroo rat reserve for the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency. It is a cornerstone reserve in the Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The wildlife area needs to be delineated on all maps used in this presentation and within any environmental documents related to this CUP.

The Friends are concerned that the project description remains cursory in order to avoid an examination of the full extent of the project impacts. The proposal continues to propose a trap and skeet range. It is not clear whether or not the trap and skeet range will be open for use by the general public (there is a provision for 20 automobile parking spaces). The Initial Study prepared by the Planning Department staff indicates that the Hunt Club will provide by-laws to restrain the use of lead shot on the shooting range. The Friends believe this proposed mitigation measure is merely a concession to the project proponent. It will not be effective or enforceable by the county and is not commensurate with the seriousness of the discharge of lead at this sensitive location. The Planning Commission also needs to consider the effect of lead pollution on the downstream users (Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore) of the San Jacinto River. We have attached a copy of The Wildlife Society

position statement on the use of lead ammunition for consideration by the Planning Commission and request it be included in the administrative record for CUP 3464.

The Friends also believe it imperative that the CEQA document for this project examine whether or not a trap and skeet range with its high intensity noise will be a detriment to wildlife use of the MSHCP lands surrounding the project site. It makes little sense for the State of California and the County of Riverside to spend millions of public dollars acquiring wildlife conservation lands and then approve conflicting uses within those conservation lands.

Since our testimony in May 2008, the Friends have become aware that the project applicant (Ramona Duck Club) is inappropriately blocking the access to public lands which comprise the San Jacinto Wildlife Area. Attached are recent photographs of the project proponent's newly constructed iron-gate which is preventing the public from accessing hundreds of acres of public lands on the SJWA (APN: 425050024, 425050004, 423040015, 423040019). The project applicant's blockade of public access to these existing regional conservation/recreational lands is a significant project impact, and it warrants resolution in the CEQA document. The Friends are concerned that if the project proponent is allowed to prevent public access to these public lands it will constitute a gift of these lands to the project applicant.

The Friends are requesting that the Planning Commission defer the approval of CUP 3464 pending the preparation and public review of the appropriate CEQA document for this project.

Thank you for considering our comments. Please notify us of all documents, meetings, and other materials pertinent to this project.


Sincerely,



Ann L. Turner-McKibben, President
(951) 924-8150
e-mail: northfriends@northfriends.org

Attachments:

Lead in Ammunition and Fishing Tackle: Final Position Statement, The Wildlife Society,
Bethesda, MD, July 2009.
Photographs (2), Ramona Hunt Club Entrance Gate, September 2009.



THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY

5410 Grosvenor Lane • Bethesda, MD 20814-2144
Tel: (301) 897-9770 • Fax: (301) 530-2471
E-mail: tws@wildlife.org

Final Position Statement

Lead in Ammunition and Fishing Tackle

Lead has been used in ammunition and fishing tackle for centuries. It is an effective and inexpensive element for the manufacture of projectiles and weights. Although it is a naturally occurring element in the environment, lead has no functional or beneficial role in biological systems, and at very low levels of exposure it can be toxic, depending on the species and the health and age of an individual. At toxic levels lead damages the nervous system, causing paralysis and eventual death; at lower levels it is known to cause a variety of sublethal effects such as neurological damage, tissue and organ damage, and reproductive impairment.

Realization of the hazards of lead ammunition to waterfowl and some upland game birds can be traced to the late 1870s, while the hazards of lead fishing sinkers to waterfowl became apparent in the 1970s, when lead was found to poison swans in the United Kingdom (UK). In the 1970s and 1980s, the UK and some jurisdictions within the United States and Canada began placing restrictions on the use of lead ammunition and fishing tackle. Today lead from ammunition and fishing tackle provides a small fraction of total environmental releases, but it exists in a form that can be readily ingested by some species of wildlife.

Metallic lead can remain relatively stable and intact for decades, even centuries. However, under certain environmental conditions (e.g., acidic or basic water or soil) lead from shot or tackle can be readily released and taken up by plants or animals, causing a range of biochemical, physiological, and behavioral effects in some species of invertebrates, fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals. Lead that is adsorbed or incorporated into food items through the soil, as well as lead fragments in carcasses or deposited at shooting sites, is known to be consumed by some birds and small mammals, resulting in elevated lead concentrations. Ingestion by reptiles, birds, and mammals of spent ammunition and lost fishing tackle has also been documented and can cause a range of negative effects in individuals, potentially leading to population-level consequences in some species (e.g., waterfowl, eagles, condors, mourning doves, and loons).

From a public health perspective, lead potentially can lead to a variety of human health problems, such as neurological effects and stunted growth, particularly in children. Although the extent is still unclear, recent research indicates that consumption of game taken with lead ammunition may increase blood-lead levels in humans. When lead that is imbedded in game meat becomes exposed to acid in the human stomach, lead may be absorbed into the system. Even if a lead pellet or bullet completely passes through an animal, a small amount of lead may be left in the tissue and may be absorbed by a person consuming the meat.

Lead poisoning related to spent ammunition and lost fishing tackle has been extensively studied in birds, and at least two studies indicate that the ban on the use of lead ammunition for hunting

waterfowl and coots in North America has successfully reduced lead exposure in waterfowl. Nonetheless, other species such as upland game birds (e.g., doves and quail) and scavengers (e.g., vultures and eagles) have been documented to be exposed to lead, and the California condor population may be at risk. Despite the prohibition on lead shot for waterfowl hunting, current data for raptors and avian scavengers indicate increases in lead exposure in these species, especially during hunting season. Accordingly, 24 states (as of 2008) have instituted restrictions on the use of lead ammunition to minimize effects to upland game birds, eagles, and other species. The hazard of ingested lead sinkers and fishing tackle is well-documented in swans and loons, and restrictions on the sale or use of lead weights have been instituted in parts of the UK, Canada, several other countries, and five states in the U.S. (as of 2008) in order to minimize effects on these and other potentially vulnerable species. There are only limited data on the adverse effects of lead ingestion at shooting ranges, and reproductive and mortality rates at these sites have not been adequately investigated.

There has been an extensive effort in the development, efficacy testing, and regulation of alternatives to lead-based ammunition for hunting waterfowl and waterbirds. Several effective nontoxic alternatives have been approved and currently are available in North America and elsewhere. Several manufacturers have developed nontoxic ammunition that can be used safely in all gauges of modern shotguns, as well as nontoxic rifle bullets for hunting large game. However, the widespread manufacture of this shotgun and rifle ammunition depends on assured markets provided by regulation and enforcement. Nontoxic shot may be used in all clay target sports and currently is required by some shooting facilities. Dozens of substitutes for lead fishing tackle have entered the marketplace in recent years. A few, but not all, alternative metals in fishing tackle have been deemed safe if ingested by waterfowl and some other birds and mammals.

The policy of The Wildlife Society in regard to lead in ammunition and fishing tackle is to:

1. Recognize that lead has been known for centuries to be a broad-spectrum toxicant to humans and wildlife.
2. Advocate the replacement of lead-based ammunition and fishing tackle with nontoxic products, while recognizing that complete replacement may not be possible in specific circumstances.
3. Recognize that the removal of lead for hunting, fishing, and shooting will require collaboration among affected stakeholders (including wildlife professionals, ammunition and tackle manufacturers, sportsmen, policymakers, and the public). It may require a phased-in approach, and will require explicit and targeted educational strategies at both the national and international levels, thereby acknowledging and supporting the crucial role that hunters and anglers play in wildlife management and conservation.
4. Encourage studies on reducing barriers to the development of nontoxic ammunition and fishing tackle, additional research that generates toxicological and environmental chemistry data, monitoring and modeling of exposure effects, and studies predicting consequences of exposure and long-term population-level effects. The need for additional

information, however, should not delay the educational efforts and the phasing-in of nontoxic ammunition and tackle where practicable.

5. Support educational efforts to promote greater public awareness and understanding of the consequences of lead exposure to wildlife populations, and emphasize the potential gains for wildlife and environmental quality from use of nontoxic ammunition and fishing tackle.

Approved by Council July 2009. Expires July 2014.

FRIENDS OF THE NORTHERN SAN JACINTO VALLEY

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO	Jeffrey Childers	FROM	Ann L. Turner-McKibben
COMPANY:	Riverside County Planning Department	DATE:	10/13/2009
FAX NUMBER:	(951) 955-3157	TOTAL NO OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:	2, Including Cover Sheet
PHONE NUMBER:	(951) 955-3626		

RE:
Proposed Mitigated Negative
Declaration (MND) for the
Ramona Duck Club Conditional
Use Permit (CUP) 3464

NOTES/COMMENTS

I am emailing out letter along with
our Sept 29, 2009 comment letter.
Please include our comments

RECEIVED
OCT 15 2009

ADMINISTRATION
RIVERSIDE COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

FRIENDS OF THE NORTHERN SAN JACINTO VALLEY
P.O. Box 9097
Moreno Valley, CA 92552-9097
www.northfriends.org

13 October 20009

Via e-mail (JCHILDER@rctlma.org) and FAX (951) 955-3157

Mr. Jeffery Childers, Planner IV
Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor
P.O. Box 1409
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

Dear Mr. Childers:


RE: Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Ramona Duck Club Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 3464

The Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley (Friends) sought to review and comment on the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for CUP 3464, but we were not able to locate an actual MND document. After making several inquires to the Riverside County Planning Department, we were advised the project MND was a compilation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Initial Study and the project conditions of approval being recommended by the Riverside County Planning Department. The Friends believe that such an implementation of CEQA by Riverside County is faulty and contrary to the requirements of the law.

The Friends are concerned that Riverside County is improperly implementing CEQA to discourage participation and hinder the review of environmental documents by the public. The Friends are also disturbed that Riverside County appears to be sending faulty or inadequate CEQA documents to the State Clearing House to be reviewed by State Trustee and Responsible agencies.

The Friends request that our comment letter dated September 29, 2009 and presented at the September 30, 2009 Riverside County Planning Commission public hearing on CUP 3464 be incorporated by reference into the subject letter. We have attached a copy of the letter. The Friends are also requesting the Riverside County Planning Commission defer approval of this project until an adequate CEQA document (Mitigated Negative Declaration or Draft EIR) has been presented to the public for review and comment.

Sincerely,



Ann L. Turner-McKibben, President
(951) 924-8150
e-mail: northfriends@northfriends.org

Attached:

Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley, September 29, 2009 Comment Letter on the Ramona Duck Club Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 3464

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
and
INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

A PUBLIC HEARING has been scheduled, pursuant to Riverside County Land Use Ordinance No. 348, before the **RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION** to consider the project shown below:

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 3464 – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Ramona Duck Club – Engineer/Representative: Overton Kuhn – Fifth Supervisorial District – Reche Canyon / Badlands Area Plan: Open Space: Conservation (OS:C) – Location: Northeastly of Main Street, southwesterly of Contour Road, and easterly of Main Street – 91.49 Gross Acres. – Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R) and Heavy Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) – **REQUEST:** The Conditional Use Permit proposes to extend the life of existing operation of a hunting club. The existing development is comprised of eleven (11) RV/Trailer parking spaces, an 8 foot by 12 foot tool shed, and the existing well that serves the property. The proposed improvements that will occur only on the southerly two (2) acres include eight (8) additional RV parking spaces, two (2) 10 foot by 40 foot storage containers, 20 automobile parking spaces, two (2) 7,500 gallon water storage tanks, a trap and skeet range area, and portable restrooms used only during the five (5) month hunting period – APN(s): 425-050-025, 423-040-017, and 423-050-008. (Quasi-Judicial)

TIME OF HEARING: 9:00 a.m. or as soon as possible thereafter.
DATE OF HEARING: September 30, 2009
PLACE OF HEARING: RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER
BOARD CHAMBERS, 1ST FLOOR
4080 LEMON STREET
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

For further information regarding this project, please contact Project Planner, Jeffery Childers, at 951-955-3626 or email jchilder@rctlma.org, or go to the County Planning Department's Planning Commission agenda web page at http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/planning/content/hearings/pc/current_pc.html.

...e Riverside County Planning Department has determined that the above project will not have a significant effect on the environment and has recommended adoption of a mitigated negative declaration. The Planning Commission will consider the proposed project and the proposed mitigated negative declaration, at the public hearing. The case file for the proposed project and the proposed mitigated negative declaration may be viewed Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., (with the exception of Noon-1:00 p.m. and holidays) at the County of Riverside Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92502. For further information or an appointment, contact the project planner.

Any person wishing to comment on a proposed project may do so, in writing, between the date of this notice and the public hearing or appear and be heard at the time and place noted above. All comments received prior to the public hearing will be submitted to the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission will consider such comments, in addition to any oral testimony, before making a decision on the proposed project.

If you challenge this project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing, described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing. Be advised that, as a result of public hearings and comment, the Planning Commission may amend, in whole or in part, the proposed project. Accordingly, the designations, development standards, design or improvements, or any properties or lands, within the boundaries of the proposed project, may be changed in a way other than specifically proposed.

Please send all written correspondence to:
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Attn: Jeffery Childers
Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409

PROPERTY OWNERS CERTIFICATION FORM

I, VINNIE NGUYEN, certify that on 6/16/09

The attached property owners list was prepared by Riverside County GIS

APN (s) or case numbers CUPO3464 For

Company or Individual's Name Planning Department

Distance buffered 600' 2400'

Pursuant to application requirements furnished by the Riverside County Planning Department, Said list is a complete and true compilation of the owners of the subject property and all other property owners within 600 feet of the property involved, or if that area yields less than 25 different owners, all property owners within a notification area expanded to yield a minimum of 25 different owners, to a maximum notification area of 2,400 feet from the project boundaries, based upon the latest equalized assessment rolls. If the project is a subdivision with identified off-site access/improvements, said list includes a complete and true compilation of the names and mailing addresses of the owners of all property that is adjacent to the proposed off-site improvement/alignment.

I further certify that the information filed is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that incorrect or incomplete information may be grounds for rejection or denial of the application.

NAME: Vinnie Nguyen

TITLE GIS Analyst


ADDRESS: 4080 Lemon Street 2nd Floor

Riverside, Ca. 92502

TELEPHONE NUMBER (8 a.m. - 5 p.m.): (951) 955-8158

✓ 8/11/09 *CA*
Expires 2/10/10

2400 feet buffer



Selected parcel(s):

423-040-010 423-040-015 423-040-017 423-040-019 423-050-003 423-050-005 423-100-020
 423-110-004 423-140-001 423-140-006 425-040-015 425-040-017 425-050-002 425-050-006

IMPORTANT

This information is made available through the Riverside County Geographic Information System. The information is for reference purposes only. It is intended to be used as base level information only and is not intended to replace any recorded documents or other public records. Contact appropriate County Department or Agency if necessary. Reference to recorded documents and public records may be necessary and is advisable.

MAP PRINTED ON...06/16/2009

APN: 423040010 ASMT: 423040010
STATE OF CALIF
1416 9TH ST NO 120622
SACRAMENTO CA 95814

APN: 423040015 ASMT: 423040015
STATE OF CALIF DEPT FISH & GAME
C/O BILL GALLUP
1807 13TH ST STE 103
SACRAMENTO CA 95811

APN: 423040017 ASMT: 423040017
RAMONA DUCK CLUB
17130 VAN BUREN BLV NO 106
RIVERSIDE CA 92504

APN: 423040019 ASMT: 423040019
USA DEPT FISH & GAME WILDLIFE CONSER
C/O WILLIAM L GALLUP
1807 13TH ST STE 103
SACRAMENTO CA 95814

APN: 423050003 ASMT: 423050003
WILDON ASSOCIATES
12214 HEACOCK ST
MORENO VALLEY CA 92557

APN: 423050005 ASMT: 423050005
SAN JACINTO PARTNERS
C/O TOM OLSON
12214 HEACOCK ST
MORENO VALLEY CA 92557

APN: 423100020 ASMT: 423100020
STATE OF CALIF DEPT OF FISH & GAME
C/O WILLIAM L GALLUP
1807 13TH ST STE 103
SACRAMENTO CA 95814

APN: 423110004 ASMT: 423110004
DEPT OF FISH & GAME WILDLIFE
CONSERVATION
C/O WILLIAM L GALLUP
1807 13TH ST STE 103
SACRAMENTO CA 95814

APN: 423140001 ASMT: 423140001
STATE OF CALIF FISH & GAME
C/O WILLIAM L GALLUP
1807 13TH ST STE 103
SACRAMENTO CA 95814

APN: 423140006 ASMT: 423140006
SEAVIEW WILDLIFE CONSERVANCY
1450 FRAZEE RD STE 100
SAN DIEGO CA 92108

APN: 425040015 ASMT: 425040015
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING SERVICES
3133 7TH ST
RIVERSIDE CA 92501

APN: 425040017 ASMT: 425040017
JIM BOOTSMA
GAIL P BOOTSMA
P O BOX 429
SAN JACINTO CA 92581

APN: 425050002 ASMT: 425050002
JACOB LOGAR
BORIS PIRIH
ANGELA PIRIH
C/O BORIS PIRIH
1210 NORTH JEFFERSON NO J
ANAHEIM CA 92807

APN: 425050006 ASMT: 425050006
MARVO HOLSTEINS
C/O FRANK MORMINO
P O BOX 4439
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91729

ATTN: Michael McCoy
Riverside Transit Agency
1333 3rd St.
P.O. Box 59968
Riverside, CA 92517-1968

ATTN: Linda Guillis, Community &
Economic Director
Planning Department,
City of Moreno Valley
14177 Frederick St.
Moreno Valley, CA 92553-9664

San Jacinto Unified School District
2045 S. San Jacinto Ave.
San Jacinto, CA 92583-5626

ATTN: Elizabeth Lovsted
Eastern Municipal Water District
2270 Trumble Rd.
P.O. Box 8300
Perris, CA 92570

Eastern Information Center
Dept. of Anthropology
1334 Watkins Hall, University of California,
Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521-0418

Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Ave., Rm 312
P.O. Box 600
Rosemead, CA 91770

CALTRANS Division of Aeronautics
P.O. Box 942873
Sacramento, CA 94273-0001

ATTN: Nate Picket
CALTRANS District #8
464 W. 4th St., 6th Floor
Mail Stop 728
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

ATTN: Executive Officer
Reg. Water Quality Control Board #8
Santa Ana
3737 Main St., Suite 500
Riverside, CA 92501-3348

Sierra Club – Moreno Valley Group
26711 Ironwood Avenue
Moreno Valley, CA 92555

Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley
P.O. Box 9097
Moreno Valley, CA 92552-9097

Applicant:
Ramona Duck Club
Malcom Smith
11750 Sterling Ave., Ste. E
Riverside, CA 92503

Eng-Rep:
Overton Khun
1173 Catalina St.
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Owner:
Ramona Duck Club
P.O. Box 106
Riverside, CA 92504

NOTICE OF COMPLETION & ENVIRONMENTAL TRANSMITTAL FORM

SCH#: _____

Project Title: Conditional Use Permit No. 3464

Lead Agency: County of Riverside Planning Dept.
Mailing Address: 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor PO Box 1409
City: Riverside **Zip:** 92502-1409

Contact Person: Jeffery Childers
Phone: 951-955-3626
County: Riverside

Project Location

County: Riverside **City/Community:** Nuevo
Cross Streets: Northeasterly of Main Street, southwesterly of Contour Road **Zip Code:** 92567
Assessor's Parcel No(s): 425-050-025, 423-040-017, and 423-050-008 **Section** 27 **Twp:** 3 south **Range:** 2 west **Base:** San Bernardino
Latitude/Longitude: 33° 52' 15" North/ 117° 6' 16" West **Total Acres:** 91.49
Within 2 miles: **State Hwy#:** 60 **Waterways:** San Jacinto River
Airports: N/A **Railways:** N/A **Schools:** N/A

Document Type:

CEQA: NOP Draft EIR Supplemental EIR Subsequent EIR Other _____
 Early Cons Neg Dec Mit Neg Dec

NEPA: NOI EA Draft EIS FONSI

Other: Joint Document Final Document Other _____

Local Action Type:

General Plan Update Specific Plan Rezone Annexation
 General Plan Amendment Master Plan Prezone Redevelopment
 General Plan Element Planned Unit Development Use Permit Coastal Permit
 Community Plan Site Plan Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) Other _____

Development Type:

Residential: Units _____ Acres _____ Transportation: Type _____
 Office: Sq.Ft _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ Mining: Mineral _____
 Commercial: Sq.Ft _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ Power: Type _____ Watts _____
 Industrial: Sq.Ft _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ Waste Management: Type _____
 Educational: _____ Hazardous Waste: Type _____
 Recreational: Hunt Club Other: _____
 Water Facilities: Type _____ MGD _____

Project Issues That May Have A Significant or Potentially Significant Impact

Aesthetic/Visual Flood Plain/Flooding Schools/Universities Water Quality
 Agricultural Land Forest Land/Fire Hazard Septic Systems Water Supply/Groundwater
 Air Quality Geologic/Seismic Sewer Capacity Wetland/Riparian
 Archaeology/Historical Minerals Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading Growth Inducing
 Biological Resources Noise Solid Waste Land Use
 Coastal Zone Population/Housing Balance Toxic/Hazardous Cumulative Effects
 Drainage/Absorption Public Services/Facilities Traffic/Circulation Other: _____
 Economic/Jobs Recreation/Parks Vegetation
 Fiscal

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation: Open Space-Conservation (OS-C)/ Heavy Agriculture (A-2-10) and Rural Residential (R-R)

Project Description (use separate sheet if necessary):

Conditional Use Permit No. 3464 proposes to permit an existing operation of a hunting club. The existing development is comprised of RV/Trailer parking spaces, an 8 foot by 12 foot tool shed, and the existing well that serves the property. The proposed improvements that will occur only on the southerly two (2) acres include 8 additional RV parking spaces, two (2) 10 foot by 40 foot storage containers, 20 automobile parking spaces, two (2) 7,500 gallon water storage tanks, a trap and skeet range area, and portable restrooms used only during the 5 month hunting period

Reviewing Agencies Checklist
 (Recommend Clearinghouse distribution by checking appropriate boxes)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Resources Board | <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Emergency Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Boating/Waterways, Dept. of Calif. Highway Patrol | <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Historic Preservation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans District # 8 | <input type="checkbox"/> Parks & Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Division of Aeronautics | <input type="checkbox"/> Pesticide Regulation, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utilities Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy | <input type="checkbox"/> Reclamation Board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Conservancy | <input type="checkbox"/> Regional WQCB # <u>*SELECT ONE*</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Colorado River Board Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Corrections, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> San Gabriel & Lower Los Angeles Rivers & Mountains Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Delta Protection Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> San Joaquin River Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education, Dept. of Office of Public School Construction | <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> State Lands Commission |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region #6 | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Clean Water Grants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food & Agriculture, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry & Fire Protection | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Rights |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Services, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Historic Preservation | <input type="checkbox"/> Toxic Substances Control, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Services, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing and Community Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Waste Management Board | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Native American Heritage Commission | |


Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date: September 4, 2009

Ending Date: October 5, 2009

Lead Agency: Riverside County Planning Department. Consulting Firm _____ Address: <u>4080 Lemon Street</u> City/State/Zip: <u>Riverside CA 9502</u> Contact: <u>Matt Straite</u> Phone: <u>951-955-0545</u>

Applicant <u>Ramona Duck Club</u> Address: <u>11750 Sterling Ave. Suite E</u> City/State/Zip: <u>Riverside, CA 92503</u> Phone: <u>951-955-3626</u>

Signature of the Lead Agency Representative  Date: 9-2-09

Envelopes to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044
Certified or Fed Ex packages to: State Clearinghouse, 1400 Tenth Street, Suite 222, Sacramento, CA 95814

Revised: 6/12/07
 Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\CUP03464\DH-PC-BOS Hearings\PC 9-30-09\SCH\NOC and Environmental Transmittal Form.doc

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY

George A. Johnson · Agency Director

Planning Department

Ron Goldman · Planning Director

TO: Office of Planning and Research (OPR)
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044
 County of Riverside County Clerk

FROM: Riverside County Planning Department
 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor
P. O. Box 1409
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

38686 El Cerrito Road
Palm Desert, California 92211

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code.

Conditional Use Permit No. 3464

Project Title/Case Numbers

Jeffery Childers
County Contact Person

951-955-3626
Phone Number

N/A

State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to the State Clearinghouse)

Ramona Duck Club
Project Applicant

P.O. Box 106 Riverside, CA 92504
Address


In the Hemet/San Jacinto area more specifically, the site is located northerly of Marvin Road, southwesterly of Central Avenue, and easterly of Main Street.
Project Location

The Conditional Use Permit proposes to permit an existing operation of a hunting club. The existing development is comprised of 11 RV/Trailer parking spaces, an 8 foot by 12 foot tool shed, and the existing well that serves the property. The proposed improvements that will occur only on the southerly 2 acres includes 8 additional RV parking spaces, two (2) 10 foot by 40 foot cargo containers, 20 automobile parking spaces, two (2) 7,500 gallon water storage tanks, a trap and skeet range area, and portable restrooms used only during the 5 month hunting period.
Project Description

This is to advise that the Riverside County Planning Commission, as the lead agency, has approved the above-referenced project on _____, and has made the following determinations regarding that project:

1. The project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment.
A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act. (\$1,993.00 plus \$64.00) mitigation measures WERE made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan/Program WAS adopted.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations WAS NOT adopted for the project.

This is to certify that the Mitigated Negative Declaration, with comments, responses, and record of project approval is available to the general public at: Riverside County Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501.


Signature


Title


Date

Date Received for Filing and Posting at OPR: _____

Y:\Planning Master Forms\CEQA Forms\NOD Form.doc Revised 01/15/08

Please charge deposit fee case#: ZEA

ZCFG

FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY

George A. Johnson · Agency Director

Planning Department

Ron Goldman · Planning Director

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project/Case Number: CUP03464

Based on the Initial Study, it has been determined that the proposed project, subject to the proposed mitigation measures, will not have a significant effect upon the environment.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES REQUIRED TO AVOID POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. (see Environmental Assessment and Conditions of Approval)

COMPLETED/REVIEWED BY:

By: Jeffery Childers Title: Project Planner Date: August 11, 2009

Applicant/Project Sponsor: Ramona Duck Club Date Submitted: September 12, 2005

ADOPTED BY: Planning Commission

Person Verifying Adoption: _____ Date: 8/11/09

The Mitigated Negative Declaration may be examined, along with documents referenced in the initial study, if any, at:

Riverside County Planning Department 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501

For additional information, please contact Jeffery Childers at 951-955-3626.

Revised: 10/16/07

Y:\Planning Master Forms\CEQA Forms\Mitigated Negative Declaration.doc

Please charge deposit fee case#: ZEA

ZCFG

FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY

[Empty box for County Clerk's Use Only]

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
SPECIALIZED DEPARTMENT RECEIPT
Permit Assistance Center

O* REPRINTED * T0512686

4080 Lemon Street
Second Floor
Riverside, CA 92502
(951) 955-3200

39493 Los Alamos Road
Suite A
Murrieta, CA 92563
(951) 694-5242

38686 El Cerrito Rd
Indio, CA 92211
(760) 863-8271

Received from: RAMONA DUCK CLUB \$64.00
paid by: CK 777
CALIF FISH & GAME FEE FOR EA40284
paid towards: CFG03740 CALIF FISH & GAME: DOC FEE
at parcel: 78 BRIDGE ST LVIE
appl type: CFG3

By _____ Sep 12, 2005 10:45
SBROSTRO posting date Sep 12, 2005

Account Code	Description	Amount
658353120100208100	CF&G TRUST: RECORD FEES	\$64.00

Overpayments of less than \$5.00 will not be refunded!

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
SPECIALIZED DEPARTMENT RECEIPT
Permit Assistance Center

N* REPRINTED * R0912652

4080 Lemon Street
Second Floor
Riverside, CA 92502
(951) 955-3200

39493 Los Alamos Road
Suite A
Murrieta, CA 92563
(951) 694-5242

38686 El Cerrito Rd
Indio, CA 92211
(760) 863-8271

Received from: RAMONA DUCK CLUB \$1,993.00
paid by: CK 1224
CALIF FISH & GAME FEE FOR EA40284
paid towards: CFG03740 CALIF FISH & GAME: DOC FEE
at parcel: 78 BRIDGE ST LVIE
appl type: CFG3

By _____ Sep 02, 2009 15:16
SBROSTRO posting date Sep 02, 2009

Account Code	Description	Amount
658353120100208100	CF&G TRUST	\$1,993.00

Overpayments of less than \$5.00 will not be refunded!