

Scan

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY

George A. Johnson · Agency Director

Planning Department

Ron Goldman · Planning Director

DATE: May 11, 2010

TO: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Planning Department - Riverside Office

SUBJECT: SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 310 SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 1

(Charge your time to these case numbers)

The attached item(s) require the following action(s) by the Board of Supervisors:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Place on Administrative Action (Receive & File; EOT) | <input type="checkbox"/> Set for Hearing (Legislative Action Required; CZ, GPA, SP, SPA) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Labels provided If Set For Hearing | <input type="checkbox"/> Publish in Newspaper: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10 Day <input type="checkbox"/> 20 Day <input type="checkbox"/> 30 day | **SELECT Advertisement** |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Place on Consent Calendar | <input type="checkbox"/> **SELECT CEQA Determination** |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Place on Policy Calendar (Resolutions; Ordinances; PNC) | <input type="checkbox"/> 10 Day <input type="checkbox"/> 20 Day <input type="checkbox"/> 30 day |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Place on Section Initiation Proceeding (GPIP) | <input type="checkbox"/> Notify Property Owners (app/agencies/property owner labels provided) |
| | Controversial: <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |

Designate Newspaper used by Planning Department for Notice of Hearing:
(3rd Dist) Press Enterprise and The Californian

Please schedule on the May 25, 2010 BOS Agenda

BOS 5.13.10.

Ron
5-13-10

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



FROM: TLMA - Planning Department

SUBMITTAL DATE:
May 13, 2010

SUBJECT: SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 310 SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 1 – Applicant: Domenigoni Barton Properties – Engineer/Representative: AEI- CASC Consultants- Third Supervisorial District – Winchester and French Valley Zoning Districts – Harvest Valley/Winchester and Southwest Area Plans: Community Development: Mixed Use (8-14 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Commercial Recreation; Commercial; Medium Density Residential (2-5 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Medium High Density Residential (5-8 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Low Density Residential (1-3 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Paseo/Greenbelt; Open Space; Golf; Parks; Schools; and Circulation as reflected in the Land Use Plan. – Location: Northerly of Keller Road, southerly of Holland Road, along Winchester Road and easterly of Eucalyptus Road – 1,735 Gross Acres - Zoning: Specific Plan (SP) - **REQUEST:** The Substantial Conformance proposes modifications to the Specific Plan resulting from the widening of Highway 79 and revised Transportation intersection spacing requirements. – APN(s) 466-150-007, 466-160-013, 466-160-014, 466-170-032, 466-170-033, 466-180-018, 466-240-002, 466-250-028, 466-260-001, 472-100-015, 472-100-016, 472-100-017, 472-100-018. – Related Cases- SP00310 (Legislative)

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

RECEIVE AND FILE the Notice of Decision by the Planning Commission on May 5, 2010.

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

CONSIDERED an **ADDENDUM TO EIR NO. 421** and **SUPPLEMENTAL EIR NO. 421** originally

Ron Goldman
Planning Director

Initials:
RG:vc
RG

(continued on attached page)

REVIEWED BY EXECUTIVE OFF/ _____
DATE _____ Tina Grande
Departmental Concurrence

Dep't Rec Policy
Per Exec. Ofc.: Consent Policy
 Consent

Prev. Agn. Ref.

District: Third

Agenda Number:

The Honorable Board of Supervisors

Re: **SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 310 SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 1**

Page 2 of 2

prepared for Specific Plan No. 310 pursuant to Environmental Assessment No. 42296 based on the findings incorporated in the initial study; and,

APPROVED SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 310 SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 1, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER MAY 5, 2010
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER**

- I. AGENDA ITEM 4.1: SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 310 SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 1** - Consider Addendum to Environmental Impact Report No. 421 - Applicant: Domenigoni Barton Properties - Engineer/Representative: AEI - CASC Consultants- Third Supervisorial District - Winchester and French Valley Zoning Districts - Harvest Valley/Winchester and Southwest Area Plans: Community Development: Mixed Use (8-14 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Commercial Recreation; Commercial; Medium Density Residential (2-5 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Medium High Density Residential (5-8 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Low Density Residential (1-3 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Paseo/Greenbelt; Open Space; Golf; Parks; Schools; and Circulation as reflected in the Specific Plan Land Use Plan (SP310). - Location: Northerly of Keller Road, southerly of Craig Road, bisected by Winchester Road and easterly of Abbot Road - 1,735 Gross Acres - Zoning: Specific Plan (SP) - **APNs:** 466-150-007, 466-160-013, 466-160-014, 466-170-032, 466-170-033, 466-180-018, 466-240-002, 466-250-028, 466-260-001, 472-100-015, 472-100-016, 472-100-017 and 472-100-018 - (Continued from 4/7/2010) - (Legislative)
- II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
The Substantial Conformance proposes modifications to the Specific Plan resulting from the widening of Highway 79 and revised Transportation intersection spacing requirements.
- III. MEETING SUMMARY**
Subject proposal did not require a presentation.
Project Planner: Matt Straite, Ph: (951) 955-8631 or E-mail mstraite@rctlma.org
- No one spoke in favor, neutral or in opposition of the subject proposal.
- IV. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES**
NONE
- V. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**
The Planning Commission, by a vote of 4-0 (Commissioner Zuppardo absent); recommended to the Board of Supervisors;
- CONSIDERATION of ADDENDUM TO EIR NO. 421 and SUPPLEMENTAL EIR NO. 421** originally prepared for Specific Plan No. 310 pursuant to Environmental Assessment No. 42296 based on the findings incorporated in the initial study; and,
- APPROVAL of SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 310 SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 1**, 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.: 4.1
Area Plan: Harvest Valley/Winchester and Southwest
Zoning Area: Winchester and French Valley
Supervisory District: Third
Project Planner: Matt Straite
Planning Commission: May 5, 2010
Continued from: April 7, 2010

Specific Plan No. 310 Substantial Conformance No. 1
Addendum to Supplemental EIR no 421
Applicant: Domenigoni Barton Properties
Engineer/Representative: AEI-CASC Consulting

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT
STAFF REPORT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

Specific Plan No. 310 Substantial Conformance No. 1 is a proposed revision to the Domenigoni Specific Plan, SP310, which was originally approved December 14, 2004. The project is located in the Harvest Valley/Winchester and Southwest Area Plans, more specifically it is northerly of Keller Road, southerly of Craig Road, bisected by Winchester Road and easterly of Abbot Road.

The project is proposing a determination of Substantial Conformance for Specific Plan 310 resulting from:

1. Phases 1 and 2 of Riverside County's SR 79 road widening project from Station 165+64.937 to Station 252+50.
2. Clarifications to the open space acreage descriptions.
3. Changes to Planning Area configurations resulting from the County's desired minimum intersection spacing along Scott Road and Washington Street.

More detail is provided below.

1. Changes to Reflect County's SR 79 Road Widening Project:

The land use acreages for Specific Plan 310's Planning Areas were based upon a 184-foot right of way for SR 79. The right of way ultimately approved for the SR 79 road widening project and reflected in the Specific Plan 310 conditions of approval is 220 feet in width. Additionally, acreage outside of the right of way is required for slopes, drainage facilities, a water line easement and temporary construction easements for the current segment of the SR 79 road widening project that would have a minor impact on avoidance of passive open space acreage. As a result, certain Planning Area boundaries and land use acreage numbers included in Specific Plan 310 Land Use Tables II-14 and IV-1, Board of Supervisors Resolution 2004-538 approving Specific Plan 310 at Section H.1 (page 29) and Section 3 (page 69), and conditions of approval, must be adjusted in connection with the County's SR 79 improvements, as follows:

Change the total acreage for Specific Plan from 1,734.5 acres to 1,713.52 acres, as set forth in Resolution 2004-538, section A, page 4;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 2 (Mixed Use) from 53.10 acres to 51.93 acres;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 3 (Comm. Rec.) from 70.80 acres to 70.71 acres;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 4 (Mixed Use) from 104.0 acres to 103 acres;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 18 (Open Space) from 45.3 acres to 45.27 acres; Planning Area 18 is part of the Northern Corridor Habitat MSHCP conservation dedication to the RCA.

Change the acreage of Planning Area 20 (Open Space/Golf Course) from 218.6 acres to 217.48 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 21 from 24.8 acres to 23.72 acres;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 24 (Commercial) from 8.6 acres to 7.83 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 25 (Comm. Rec.) from 47.10 acres to 46.86 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 26 (Commercial) from 10.20 acres to 9.17 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 27 (Commercial) from 23.60 acres to 23.35 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 32 (LDR) from 58.40 acres to 58.25 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes). A portion of Planning Area 32 is an MSHCP conservation dedication to the RCA. This change will impact the PA32 dedication by 0.15 acres, and the total Southern Greenbelt dedication (portions of PA31, 32, 28 and 29). However, the Substantial Conformance proposes additional clarifications to the Southern Greenbelt below, see Section 2 for total Southern Greenbelt changes).

The unit counts for each impacted Planning Area will remain the same. The actual dwelling unit range permitted by the Land Use Designation will accommodate the projected unit counts within all of the impacted Planning Areas without compromising the maximum dwelling units permitted by the designations of the PA's, thus remaining consistent with the Specific Plan without the need for modification, provided that the total number of approved residential dwelling units (4,186) shall not be exceeded. Additional language will be added to condition of approval 10.PLANNING.2 in the parent case to clarify the elements outlined above.

2. Changes to Clarify Descriptions of Open Space Areas:

Some of the Conditions of Approval, as approved in 2004, are non-substantially inconsistent with each other. This Substantial Conformance will clarify these inconsistencies.

There are two clarifications proposed with this Substantial Conformance.

A. Maze Stone Area (Planning Area 16)

The Maze Stone Area (12.5 acres) was incorrectly identified in the conditions for dedication to the RCA as part of the Northern Corridor Habitat area. EIR 421 and Supplemental EIR 421 did not require the Maze Stone Area for any biological mitigation. The Substantial Conformance proposes that the area still be conserved as permanent open space by the applicant. The underlying biological and cultural mitigation obligations of SP 310 would not change. All Maze Stone Area maintenance and mitigation responsibilities will be the responsibility of the applicant.

B. 2.9 Acres in Planning Area 37

In addition to the 12.5 Acre Maze Stone Area, this Substantial Conformance is proposing to relocate 2.9 acres of incorrectly identified RCA dedication, from Planning Area 37 to the Southern Greenbelt. When SP 310 was ultimately approved Planning Area 37 was a 20 acre planning area comprised of 15 acres of MDR and 5 acres of parkland. No habitat acreage was indicated (see Specific Plan Land Use Plan Figure IV-1 and Land Use Table IV-1). Thus, the 2.9 acres required in other conditions were an error. In an effort to ensure no net loss of biological habitat, an alternative location for the 2.9 acres of habitat along the Southern Greenbelt shall be indentified prior to grading permit issuance in a location as agreed to by the County and the Applicant.

The habitat areas were correctly identified in Condition 30.Planning.42 as Planning Areas 18, 19, 28, 31 and 32. The Maze Stone Area and the 2.9 acres in PA 37 are not listed. Again, EIR 421 and Supplemental EIR 421 did not require the Maze Stone Area for any biological mitigation; however, conditions 30.Planning.46, 47 and 50 and Mitigation Measure Bio-3 incorrectly included these areas for dedication.

More specifically, conditions 30.Planning.46, 47 and 50 called for a 96.4-acre Northern Corridor Area to be dedicated to the RCA. These were based on Technical Appendix M which appeared to depict the Northern Corridor Area as:

- 12.5 acres in Planning Area 16 (the "Maze Stone Area" of SP 310);
- 45.3 acres in Planning Area 18;
- 35.7 acres in Planning Area 19; and
- 2.9 acres in Planning Area 37.

This Substantial Conformance proposes to clarify the descriptions of the Northern Corridor Habitat Area. All conditions and mitigation measure Bio-3 shall be revised to be consistent with 30.Planning.42.

The corrected acreage to be used in the conditions and mitigation measure Bio- 3 is calculated as follows:

Northern Corridor Habitat area-

- 96.4 acres (total acreage of Northern Corridor Habitat area);
- Minus 12.5 acres (Maze Stone area in PA 16 to be retained as permanent open space by the applicant);
- Minus 2.9 acres (from the relocation of 2.9 acres from Planning Area 37)
- Minus 0.03 acres (from Planning Area 18 due to road widening)

The total corrected northern corridor habitat area acreage to be dedicated to the RCA would be **80.97** acres.

Southern Greenbelt area-

54.9 acres (total acreage of southern greenbelt area as identified in the MSHCP Plan);
Minus 0.15 acres (for road dedication as identified in section 1 of this project description);
Plus 2.9 acres (relocated from Planning Area 37);

The total corrected southern greenbelt area acreage to be dedicated to the RCA would be **57.65** acres.

Section 3.3.1 of the MSHCP lists SP 310 among the approved projects determined to be consistent with the MSHCP, under the subheading "Criteria Review Consistency Prior to MSHCP Adoption". Specifically, the MSHCP says that SP 310's conservation of the 54.9-acre Southern Greenbelt contributes land to MSHCP Cells 5067, 5068, 5169 and 5170. The road widening will remove 0.15 acres from the Southern Greenbelt (in Planning Area 32), but the relocation of 2.9 acres from Planning area 37 will add to the total acreage overall. Through this Substantial Conformance the County determines that the revised overall acreage (57.65 acres) of the Southern Greenbelt resulting from the SR 79 road widening and the relocation of 2.9 acres to the greenbelt is consistent with, beneficial to, and does not conflict with, the MSHCP.

Thus, the Northern Corridor Habitat area will now dedicate 80.97 acres and the Southern Greenbelt area will dedicate 57.65 acres to the RCA as permanent open space for conservation purposes, reserving an easement to access, maintain and operate existing wells and appurtenant facilities.

The Substantial Conformance also proposes to reflect the corrected RCA dedication acreage in the following documents in order to maintain consistency:

Page II-E-6, Mitigation Measure BIO-3 and Appendix M of Supplemental EIR 421 (all done through Appendix No. 1 to the EIR);

Page 70 of Resolution 2004-538; and

Conditions of Approval No. 30.PLANNING. 46, 47 and 50.

3. Changes to Accommodate County's Intersection Spacing on Scott Road and Washington Street:

Following approval of SP 310, the County TLMA established desired minimum intersection spacing along Scott Road and Washington Street for full movement intersections at 1,320 feet, and for right in/right out movement intersections at 660 feet. Additionally, the second full movement intersection westerly from SR 79 to the westerly line of Planning Area 23 and Planning Area 36 shall be 1,203 feet instead of 1,320 feet. The configurations of Planning Areas abutting Scott Road and Washington Street would be adjusted slightly in order to best achieve the County's desired minimum intersection spacing. The changes in acreage resulting from the changes in Planning Area configurations are summarized below. The acreages for Planning Areas 20, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 32 reflect combined changes due to SR 79 road widening and Scott Road/Washington Street intersection spacing. The total number of approved residential dwelling units (4,186) shall not be exceeded. Additionally, to remain consistent

with the DEIR and the SEIR, any increases in Planning Areas will only accommodate additional access. No increase in density or uses shall be permitted.

Planning Area 20 (Open Space/Golf) decreased from 217.48 acres to 216.08 acres for an overall decrease of 1.4 acres.

Planning Area 22 (Medium/High Density Residential) decreased from 46.4 acres to 40.84 acres for an overall decrease of 5.56 acres.

Planning Area 23 (Medium/High Density Residential) increased from 21.7 acres to 27.34 acres for an overall increase of 5.64 acres.

Planning Area 24 (Commercial) increased from 7.83 acres to 12.06 acres for an overall increase of 4.23 acres.

Planning Area 25 (Commercial/Recreation) increased from 46.86 acres to 50.0 acres for an overall increase of 3.14 acres.

Planning Area 26 (Commercial) increased from 9.17 acres to 16.95 acres for an overall increase of 7.78 acres.

Planning Area 27 (Commercial) decreased from 23.35 acres to 16.09 acres for an overall decrease of 7.26 acres.

Planning Area 28 (Commercial/Recreation) increased from 54.7 acres to 55.07 acres for an overall increase of 0.37 acres.

Planning Area 29 (Medium Density Residential) increased from 62.1 acres to 62.84 acres for an overall increase of 0.74 acres.

Planning Area 31 (Low Density Residential) increased from 41.2 acres to 42.58 acres for an overall increase of 1.38 acres.

Planning Area 32 (Low Density Residential) increased from 56.85 acres to 61.94 acres for an overall increase of 5.09 acres.

Planning Area 33 (Medium Density Residential) increased from 18.6 acres to 19.56 acres for an overall increase of 0.96 acres.

Planning Area 35 (Mixed Use) increased from 10.1 acres to 10.82 acres for an overall increase of 0.72 acres.

Planning Area 36 (Mixed Use) decreased from 33.6 acres to 27.17 acres for an overall decrease of 6.43.

In total the Planning area Boundaries will be shifting; however these will not require revisions to the overall Specific Plan boundaries and all revisions will be in substantial conformance with the original approved Specific Plan.

FURTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

April 7, 2010

The project was continued from the April 7, 2010 agenda at the applicant's request.

ISSUES OF POTENTIAL CONCERN:

Specific Plan Boundaries- General Plan Amendments include maps intended to illustrate the area of the proposed change. The change in acreage proposed by this Substantial Conformance is minor enough to be considered consistent with the illustration used in the 2001 General Plan Amendment (see attached Exhibit No. 6 from Resolution 2001-378). Therefore, no GPA is required for the revision of the Specific Plan Boundaries. Additionally, a Change of Zone would be required to establish the boundaries of the SP. This was done in 2001 and unlike the General Plan exhibit, the Change of Zone is done using meets and bounds and must be revised to be consistent with this proposed Substantial Conformance proposal. The implementing Planning Area change of zone applications, already imposed by condition of approval 30.Planning.22, will accommodate any required changes as the project develops. No change of zone is needed at this time.

Increase in Commercial Acres- As noted above, part of the proposed Substantial Conformance is to address new standards by the Transportation Department regarding intersection spacing. To accommodate new standards, commercial Planning Areas 24 through 28 must augment their boundaries, and thus their sizes. To insure consistency with the previous environmental review, and to insure the intensity of the commercial planning areas do not change, any proposed Planning Area increases shall be clearly marked as access only revisions. No increases or decreases in intensity shall be permitted, or result from, this Substantial Conformance (see attached revised conditions of approval). This will insure no additional use related impacts.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Existing Land Use (Ex. #1): | Vacant and agricultural land |
| 2. Surrounding Land Use (Ex. #1): | Rural single-family homes, vacant, and agricultural lands |
| 3. Existing Zoning (Ex. #3): | Specific Plan |
| 4. Surrounding Zoning (Ex. #3): | Specific Plan to the north, Rural Residential (R-R) to the west, Light Agriculture-10 Acre Minimum (A-1-10) to the east and Heavy Agriculture (A-2) to the north. |
| 5. General Plan Designation: | Mixed Use (8-14 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Commercial Recreation; Commercial; Medium Density Residential (2-5 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Medium High Density Residential (5-8 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Low Density Residential (1-3 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Paseo/Greenbelt; Open Space; Golf; Parks; Schools; Circulation as reflected in the Land Use Plan. |
| 6. Project Data: | Total Acreage: 1,713.52
Total Proposed Dwelling Units: 4,186
Proposed Residential Acreage: 968.7 |

Proposed Commercial Acreage: 215
Proposed Parks/Open Space: 398.6

7. Environmental Concerns: See Attached Addendum to the SEIR

RECOMMENDATIONS:

CONSIDERATION of **ADDENDUM TO EIR NO. 421** and **SUPPLEMENTAL EIR NO. 421** originally prepared for Specific Plan No. 310 pursuant to Environmental Assessment No. 42296 based on the findings incorporated in the initial study; and,

APPROVAL of **SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 310 SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 1**, 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 approved Domenigoni – Barton Properties Specific Plan, Specific Plan No. 310, and with all other elements of the Riverside County General Plan.
2. The proposed project is consistent with the Specific Plan zoning classification of Ordinance No. 348 as revised for Specific Plan No. 310, 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 clearly compatible with the present and future logical development of the area.
5. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment. All proposed clarifications are consistent with all aspects of Supplemental Environmental Impact Report No. 421.
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 the Addendum to EIR 421 and SEIR 421 which are incorporated herein by reference.

1. The project site is designated Mixed Use (8-14 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Commercial Recreation; Commercial; Medium Density Residential (2-5 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Medium High Density Residential (5-8 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Low Density Residential (1-3 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Paseo/Greenbelt; Open Space; Golf; Parks; Schools; Circulation as reflected in the Land Use Plan. on the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plans.

2. The proposed revisions are consistent with Specific Plan No 310, and all sections of the General Plan.
3. The project site is surrounded by properties which are have the following General Plan Land Use designations: Community Development: Low Density Residential (LDR) to the west and north, Medium Density Residential (MDR) to the north, Public Facilities (PF) to the east, Commercial Retail (CR), Rural: Rural Residential (RR) to the west , Rural Community: Estate Density Residential (RC-EDR) to the west, Open Space: Recreation (OS-R) to the east.
4. The zoning for the subject site is Specific Plan.
5. The proposed revision is consistent with the Specific Plan Zoning Ordinance and all other aspects of Ordinance 348.
6. The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned Specific Plan to the north, Rural Residential (R-R) to the west, Light Agriculture-10 Acre Minimum (A-1-10) to the east and Heavy Agriculture (A-2) to the north.
7. Similar uses have been approved in the project vicinity.
8. This project is located with criterion cells of the MSHCP plan. Pursuant to MSHCP Sections 3.3.1 and 7.3.1, Final MSHCP EIR p. 12-4, SP 310 SEIR pp. II-E-4-7, BOS Resolution No. 2004-538, p. 120, and the approved HANS letter, construction of Specific Plan No. 310, as revised by the Substantial Conformance, is consistent with the MSHCP guidelines and criteria; and the proposed project does not conflict with the MSHCP.
9. This project is not located within the City Sphere of Influence of the City of Menifee.
10. The residential units for the Specific Plan will not exceed 4,186. This Substantial Conformance does not alter or modify the total unit in any way.
11. Some increases and decreases in commercial acreage is related to circulation clarifications as a result of the revised County intersection spacing requirements and will not increase or decrease the intensity of the uses.
12. The clarifications to the MSHCP conservation dedications for the Southern Corridor Habitat Area and Planning Area 18 are required for road widening purposes.
13. This proposed revision does not change the total permitted unit count and does not change any Land Use Designations for the Specific Plan Planning Areas.
14. Section 2.11 (4) of Ordinance 348 requires that certain findings can be made for a Substantial Conformance to a Specific Plan. In accordance with the Ordinance the following findings are hereby made:
 - (a) The project as modified meets the intent and purpose of the adopted specific plan; and,

(b) The project as modified is consistent with the findings and conclusions contained in the resolution adopting the specific plan.

15. A determination was made that the proposed project provided new information and therefore required an Addendum to Supplemental EIR No. 421. Some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An Addendum to the previously-certified SEIR has been prepared.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

1. As of this writing, no letters, in support or opposition have been received.
2. The project site is not located within:
 - a. High fire area;
 - b. A City sphere of influence;
 - c. The Stephens Kangaroo Rat Fee Area or Core Reserve Area.
3. The project site is located within:
 - a. An area of low and moderate liquefaction potential;
 - b. Specific Plan Required Policy Area;
 - c. Community Center General Plan Overlay;
 - d. Highway 79 Policy Area;
 - e. The boundaries of the County service Area 146;
 - f. A 100-year flood plain, an area drainage plan, and dam inundation area; and,
 - g. The Hemet Unified, Menifee Union and Perris Union High School Districts.
4. The subject site is currently designated as Assessor's Parcel Numbers 466-150-007, 466-160-013, 466-160-014, 466-170-032, 466-170-033, 466-180-018, 466-240-002, 466-250-028, 466-260-001, 472-100-015, 472-100-016, 472-100-017, 472-100-018.
5. This project was filed with the Planning Department on February 25, 2010
6. This project was a Planning Only Review and was not reviewed by the Land Development Committee.
7. Deposit Based Fees charged for this project, as of the time of staff report preparation, total \$8,568.

MS

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\SP00310S1\Hearings\May 5, 2010 PC for approval\May 5, 2010 SP310S1 Staff Report.doc

Date Prepared: 4/22/10

Date Revised:

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT


SP00310S1

EXISTING ZONING

Supervisor Stone District 3

Date Drawn: 3/1/2010

Exhibit 2




Zoning Area: Winchester and French Valley
 Township/Range: T6SR2W
 Section: 8-10, 16, 17, 21 & 22

Assessors Bk. Pg. 466 & 472
 Thomas Bros. Pg. 869 & 899
 Edition 2009



DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan providing new land use designations for unincorporated Riverside County parcels. The new 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) 955-3200 (Western County), or in Indio at (760) 863-8277 (Eastern County) or website at <http://www.tlma.ca.riverside.ca.us/finetax.html>




RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

SP00310S1

EXISTING GENERAL PLAN


Supervisor Stone
District: 3

Date Drawn: 3/1/2010
Exhibit 5



Zoning Area: Winchester and French Valley
Township/Range: T6SR2W
Section: 8-10, 16, 17, 21 & 22

Assessors Bk. Pg. 466 & 472
Thomas Bros. Pg. 869 & 899
Edition 2009



DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan providing new land use designations for unincorporated Riverside County parcels. The new 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) 955-3200 (Western County), or in Indio at (760) 863-8277 (Eastern County) or website at <http://www.lrrm.co.riverside.ca.us/index.html>


RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

SP00310S1

LAND USE

Supervisor Stone
District 3

Date Drawn: 3/1/2010
Exhibit 1




Zoning Area: Winchester and French Valley
 Township/Range: T6SR2W
 Section: 8-10, 16, 17, 21 & 22




Assessors Bk. Pg. 466 & 472
 Thomas Bros. Pg. 869 & 899
 Edition 2009

DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan providing new land use designations for unincorporated Riverside County parcels. The new 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) 955-3200 (Western County), or in Indio at (760) 863-8277 (Eastern County) or website at <http://www.co.riverside.ca.us/index.html>



PLANNING AREA 2 EXHIBIT



PLANNING AREA 3 EXHIBIT



NOT TO SCALE


HOLLAND ROAD

WINCHESTER ROAD / HWY 79

PA 3








TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT = 0.13 ACRES





RIGHT-OF-WAY = 0.09 ACRES
(measured from 184' R/W)

PLANNING AREA 4 EXHIBIT




-  TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT = 0.93 ACRES
-  SLOPE AND/OR DRAINAGE EASEMENT = 0.22 ACRES
-  WATER EASEMENT AREA = 0.11 ACRES
-  RIGHT-OF-WAY = 1.00 ACRES
(measured from 184' R/W)


PLANNING AREA 18 EXHIBIT



TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT = 0.02 ACRES




SLOPE AND/OR DRAINAGE EASEMENT AREA = 0.04 ACRES






RIGHT-OF-WAY = 0.03 ACRES
(measured from 184' R/W)

PLANNING AREA 20 EXHIBIT


SHEET 1 OF 2






-  TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT = 1.01 ACRES
-  SLOPE AND/OR DRAINAGE EASEMENT = 1.61 ACRES
-  RIGHT-OF-WAY = 1.12 ACRES
(measured from 184' R/W)


PLANNING AREA 20 EXHIBIT




SHEET 2 OF 2





-  TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (SEE SHEET 1 FOR DETAILS)
-  SLOPE AND/OR DRAINAGE EASEMENT (SEE SHEET 1 FOR DETAILS)
-  RIGHT-OF-WAY (SEE SHEET 1 FOR DETAILS)

PLANNING AREA 21 EXHIBIT



-  TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT = 1.02 ACRES
-  SLOPE AND/OR DRAINAGE EASEMENT = 2.70 ACRES
-  RIGHT-OF-WAY AREA = 1.08 ACRES
(measured from 184' R/W)

PLANNING AREA 24 EXHIBIT



TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT = 0.63 ACRES





SLOPE AND/OR DRAINAGE EASEMENT = 0.01 ACRES




RIGHT-OF-WAY = 0.77 ACRES
(measured from 184' R/W)

PLANNING AREA 25 EXHIBIT




TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT = 0.18 ACRES



RIGHT-OF-WAY AREA = 0.24 ACRES
(measured from 184' R/W)

PLANNING AREA 26 EXHIBIT




TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT = 0.48 ACRES



RIGHT-OF-WAY = 1.03 ACRES
(measured from 184' R/W)

PLANNING AREA 27 EXHIBIT





NOT TO SCALE



WINCHESTER ROAD / HWY 79

WASHINGTON RD


PA 27

-  TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT = 0.19 ACRES
-  RIGHT-OF-WAY AREA = 0.25 ACRES
(measured from 184' R/W)

PLANNING AREA 32 EXHIBIT



TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT = 0.46 ACRES



RIGHT-OF-WAY AREA = 1.55 ACRES
(measured from 184' R/W)

PLANNING AREA SOUTH HABITAT BELT WEST




NOT TO SCALE


PA 32

SOUTH HABITAT
BELT WEST

WINCHESTER ROAD / HWY 79



TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT = 0.12 ACRES



RIGHT-OF-WAY = 0.15 ACRES
(Measured from 184' R/W)


**Speadsheet and Diagrams
Summarizing Changes to SP 310 to
Accommodate County's Intersection
Spacing Policy Along Scott Road and
Washington Street**

Domenigoni/Scott Road and Washington Street Intersection Spacing

Planning Area	Land Use	Approved SP acreages	PA acreage less SR 79 impacts	Adjusted PA acreages due to intersection spacing	PA acreage add / (deduct) due to intersection spacing	Impact to Dwelling Units
20	OS / Golf	218.60 AC	214.16 AC	212.76 AC	(1.40) AC	
22	MHDR	46.40 AC	46.40 AC	40.84 AC	(5.56) AC	(33.00)
23	MHDR	21.70 AC	21.70 AC	27.34 AC	5.64 AC	34.00
24	COMM	8.60 AC	8.03 AC	12.26 AC	4.23 AC	
25	COMM/REC	47.10 AC	46.86 AC	50.00 AC	3.14 AC	
26	COMM	10.20 AC	8.95 AC	16.73 AC	7.78 AC	
27	COMM	23.60 AC	23.33 AC	16.07 AC	(7.26) AC	
28	COMM/REC	54.70 AC	54.70 AC	55.07 AC	0.37 AC	
29	MDR	62.10 AC	62.10 AC	62.84 AC	0.74 AC	3.00
31	LDR	41.20 AC	41.20 AC	42.58 AC	1.38 AC	3.00
32	LDR	58.40 AC	55.96 AC	61.05 AC	5.09 AC	10.00
33	MDR	18.60 AC	18.60 AC	19.56 AC	0.96 AC	4.00
35	MU	10.10 AC	10.10 AC	10.82 AC	0.72 AC	4.00
36	MU	33.60 AC	33.60 AC	27.17 AC	(6.43) AC	(39.00)
Total					9.40 AC	(14.00)

AC=Acreas
 SP=Specific Plan No. 310
 PA=Planning Areas
 ()=Loss of Dwelling Unit

DOMENIGONI BARTON PROPERTIES
SPECIFIC PLAN 310
LAND USE CONCEPT



COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 42296

Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Specific Plan No. 310 Substantial Conformance No. 1

Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department

Address: 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92505-1409

Contact Person: Matt Straite

Telephone Number: (951) 955-8631

Applicant's Name: Domenigoni Barton Properties

Applicant's Address: 31851 Winchester Rd Winchester CA

Engineer's Name: AEI-CASC Consultants

Engineer's Address: 937 S. Via Lata, Suite 500 Colton, CA 92324

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description:

The project is proposing a determination of Substantial Conformance for Specific Plan 310 resulting from:

1. Phases 1 and 2 of Riverside County's SR 79 road widening project from Station 165+64.937 to Station 252+50.
2. Clarifications to the open space acreage descriptions.
3. Changes to Planning Area configurations resulting from the County's desired minimum intersection spacing along Scott Road and Washington Street.

More detail is provided below.

1. Changes to Reflect County's SR 79 Road Widening Project:

The land use acreages for Specific Plan 310's Planning Areas were based upon a 184-foot right of way for SR 79. The right of way ultimately approved for the SR 79 road widening project and reflected in the Specific Plan 310 conditions of approval is 220 feet in width. Additionally, acreage outside of the right of way is required for slopes, drainage facilities, a water line easement and temporary construction easements for the current segment of the SR 79 road widening project that would have a minor impact on avoidance of passive open space acreage. As a result, certain Planning Area boundaries and land use acreage numbers included in Specific Plan 310 Land Use Tables II-14 and IV-1, Board of Supervisors Resolution 2004-538 approving Specific Plan 310 at Section H.1 (page 29) and Section 3 (page 69), and conditions of approval, must be adjusted in connection with the County's SR 79 improvements, as follows:

Change the total acreage for Specific Plan from 1,734.5 acres to 1,713.52 acres, as set forth in Resolution 2004-538, section A, page 4;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 2 (Mixed Use) from 53.10 acres to 51.93 acres;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 3 (Comm. Rec.) from 70.80 acres to 70.71 acres;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 4 (Mixed Use) from 104.0 acres to 103 acres;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 18 (Open Space) from 45.3 acres to 45.27 acres; Planning Area 18 is part of the Northern Corridor Habitat MSHCP conservation dedication to the RCA.

Change the acreage of Planning Area 20 (Open Space/Golf Course) from 218.6 acres to 217.48 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 21 from 24.8 acres to 23.72 acres;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 24 (Commercial) from 8.6 acres to 7.83 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 25 (Comm. Rec.) from 47.10 acres to 46.86 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 26 (Commercial) from 10.20 acres to 9.17 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 27 (Commercial) from 23.60 acres to 23.35 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 32 (LDR) from 58.40 acres to 58.25 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes). A portion of Planning Area 32 is an MSHCP conservation dedication to the RCA. This change will impact the PA32 dedication by 0.15 acres, and the total Southern Greenbelt dedication (portions of PA31, 32, 28 and 29). However, the Substantial Conformance proposes additional clarifications to the Southern Greenbelt below, see Section 2 for total Southern Greenbelt changes).

The unit counts for each impacted Planning Area will remain the same. The actual dwelling unit range permitted by the Land Use Designation will accommodate the projected unit counts within all of the impacted Planning Areas without compromising the maximum dwelling units permitted by the designations of the PA's, thus remaining consistent with the Specific Plan without the need for modification, provided that the total number of approved residential dwelling units (4,186) shall not be exceeded. Additional language will be added to condition of approval 10.PLANNING.2 in the parent case to clarify the elements outlined above.

2. Changes to Clarify Descriptions of Open Space Areas:

Some of the Conditions of Approval, as approved in 2004, are non-substantially inconsistent with each other. This Substantial Conformance will clarify these inconsistencies.

There are two clarifications proposed with this Substantial Conformance.

A. Maze Stone Area (Planning Area 16)

The Maze Stone Area (12.5 acres) was incorrectly identified in the conditions for dedication to the RCA as part of the Northern Corridor Habitat area. EIR 421 and Supplemental EIR 421 did not require the Maze Stone Area for any biological mitigation. The Substantial Conformance proposes that the area still be conserved as permanent open space by the applicant. The underlying biological and cultural

mitigation obligations of SP 310 would not change. All Maze Stone Area maintenance and mitigation responsibilities will be the responsibility of the applicant.

B. 2.9 Acres in Planning Area 37

In addition to the 12.5 Acre Maze Stone Area, this Substantial Conformance is proposing to relocate 2.9 acres of incorrectly identified RCA dedication, from Planning Area 37 to the Southern Greenbelt. When SP 310 was ultimately approved Planning Area 37 was a 20 acre planning area comprised of 15 acres of MDR and 5 acres of parkland. No habitat acreage was indicated (see Specific Plan Land Use Plan Figure IV-1 and Land Use Table IV-1). Thus, the 2.9 acres required in other conditions were an error. In an effort to ensure no net loss of biological habitat, an alternative location for the 2.9 acres of habitat along the Southern Greenbelt shall be indentified prior to grading permit issuance in a location as agreed to by the County and the Applicant.

The habitat areas were correctly identified in Condition 30.Planning.42 as Planning Areas 18, 19, 28, 31 and 32. The Maze Stone Area and the 2.9 acres in PA 37 are not listed. Again, EIR 421 and Supplemental EIR 421 did not require the Maze Stone Area for any biological mitigation; however, conditions 30.Planning.46, 47 and 50 and Mitigation Measure Bio-3 incorrectly included these areas for dedication.

More specifically, conditions 30.Planning.46, 47 and 50 called for a 96.4-acre Northern Corridor Area to be dedicated to the RCA. These were based on Technical Appendix M which appeared to depict the Northern Corridor Area as:

- 12.5 acres in Planning Area 16 (the "Maze Stone Area" of SP 310);
- 45.3 acres in Planning Area 18;
- 35.7 acres in Planning Area 19; and
- 2.9 acres in Planning Area 37.

This Substantial Conformance proposes to clarify the descriptions of the Northern Corridor Habitat Area. All conditions and mitigation measure Bio-3 shall be revised to be consistent with 30.Planning.42.

The corrected acreage to be used in the conditions and mitigation measure Bio- 3 is calculated as follows:

Northern Corridor Habitat area-

- 96.4 acres (total acreage of Northern Corridor Habitat area);
- Minus 12.5 acres (Maze Stone area in PA 16 to be retained as permanent open space by the applicant);
- Minus 2.9 acres (from the relocation of 2.9 acres from Planning Area 37)
- Minus 0.03 acres (from Planning Area 18 due to road widening)
- The total corrected northern corridor habitat area acreage to be dedicated to the RCA would be **80.97** acres.

Southern Greenbelt area-

- 54.9 acres (total acreage of southern greenbelt area as identified in the MSHCP Plan);
- Minus 0.15 acres (for road dedication as identified in section 1 of this project description);
- Plus 2.9 acres (relocated from Planning Area 37);

The total corrected southern greenbelt area acreage to be dedicated to the RCA would be **57.65** acres.

Section 3.3.1 of the MSHCP lists SP 310 among the approved projects determined to be consistent with the MSHCP, under the subheading "Criteria Review Consistency Prior to MSHCP Adoption". Specifically, the MSHCP says that SP 310's conservation of the 54.9-acre Southern Greenbelt contributes land to MSHCP Cells 5067, 5068, 5169 and 5170. The road widening will remove 0.15 acres from the Southern Greenbelt (in Planning Area 32), but the relocation of 2.9 acres from Planning area 37 will add to the total acreage overall. Through this Substantial Conformance the County determines that the revised overall acreage (57.65 acres) of the Southern Greenbelt resulting from the SR 79 road widening and the relocation of 2.9 acres to the greenbelt is consistent with, beneficial to, and does not conflict with, the MSHCP.

Thus, the Northern Corridor Habitat area will now dedicate 80.97 acres and the Southern Greenbelt area will dedicate 57.65 acres to the RCA as permanent open space for conservation purposes, reserving an easement to access, maintain and operate existing wells and appurtenant facilities.

The Substantial Conformance also proposes to reflect the corrected RCA dedication acreage in the following documents in order to maintain consistency:

Page II-E-6, Mitigation Measure BIO-3 and Appendix M of Supplemental EIR 421 (all done through Appendix No. 1 to the EIR);
Page 70 of Resolution 2004-538; and
Conditions of Approval No. 30.PLANNING. 46, 47 and 50.

3. Changes to Accommodate County's Intersection Spacing on Scott Road and Washington Street:

Following approval of SP 310, the County TLMA established desired minimum intersection spacing along Scott Road and Washington Street for full movement intersections at 1,320 feet, and for right in/right out movement intersections at 660 feet. Additionally, the second full movement intersection westerly from SR 79 to the westerly line of Planning Area 23 and Planning Area 36 shall be 1,203 feet instead of 1,320 feet. The configurations of Planning Areas abutting Scott Road and Washington Street would be adjusted slightly in order to best achieve the County's desired minimum intersection spacing. The changes in acreage resulting from the changes in Planning Area configurations are summarized below. The acreages for Planning Areas 20, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 32 reflect combined changes due to SR 79 road widening and Scott Road/Washington Street intersection spacing. The total number of approved residential dwelling units (4,186) shall not be exceeded. Additionally, to remain consistent with the DEIR and the SEIR, any increases in Planning Areas will only accommodate additional access. No increase in density or uses shall be permitted.

Planning Area 20 (Open Space/Golf) decreased from 217.48 acres to 216.08 acres for an overall decrease of 1.4 acres.

Planning Area 22 (Medium/High Density Residential) decreased from 46.4 acres to 40.84 acres for an overall decrease of 5.56 acres.

Planning Area 23 (Medium/High Density Residential) increased from 21.7 acres to 27.34 acres for an overall increase of 5.64 acres.

Planning Area 24 (Commercial) increased from 7.83 acres to 12.06 acres for an overall increase of 4.23 acres.

Planning Area 25 (Commercial/Recreation) increased from 46.86 acres to 50.0 acres for an overall increase of 3.14 acres.

Planning Area 26 (Commercial) increased from 9.17 acres to 16.95 acres for an overall increase of 7.78 acres.

Planning Area 27 (Commercial) decreased from 23.35 acres to 16.09 acres for an overall decrease of 7.26 acres.

Planning Area 28 (Commercial/Recreation) increased from 54.7 acres to 55.07 acres for an overall increase of 0.37 acres.

Planning Area 29 (Medium Density Residential) increased from 62.1 acres to 62.84 acres for an overall increase of 0.74 acres.

Planning Area 31 (Low Density Residential) increased from 41.2 acres to 42.58 acres for an overall increase of 1.38 acres.

Planning Area 32 (Low Density Residential) increased from 56.85 acres to 61.94 acres for an overall increase of 5.09 acres.

Planning Area 33 (Medium Density Residential) increased from 18.6 acres to 19.56 acres for an overall increase of 0.96 acres.

Planning Area 35 (Mixed Use) increased from 10.1 acres to 10.82 acres for an overall increase of 0.72 acres.

Planning Area 36 (Mixed Use) decreased from 33.6 acres to 27.17 acres for an overall decrease of 6.43.

In total the Planning area Boundaries will be shifting; however these will not require revisions to the overall Specific Plan boundaries and all revisions will be in substantial conformance with the original approved Specific Plan.

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

C. Total Project Area: 1,713.52 Gross Acres

Residential Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Units: N/A	Projected No. of Residents: N/A
Commercial Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: N/A	Est. No. of Employees: N/A
Industrial Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: N/A	Est. No. of Employees: N/A
School Site Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Park Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A
Open Space Acres:	Lots: N/A	Remainder Lot Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A

D. Assessor's Parcel No(s):

ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBERS RE SR 79 PROJECT

1. 466-150-007
2. 466-160-013
3. 466-160-014

4. 466-170-032
5. 466-170-033
6. 466-180-018
7. 466-240-002
8. 466-250-028
9. 466-260-001
10. 472-100-015
11. 472-100-016
12. 472-100-017
13. 472-100-018
14. 472-110-011
15. 472-120-002
16. 472-120-006

ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBERS RE SCOTT ROAD AND WASHINGTON STREET INTERSECTION SPACING

1. 466-250-028
2. 472-100-010
3. 472-100-015
4. 472-100-016
5. 472-100-017
6. 472-100-018
7. 472-110-011
8. 472-120-002
9. 472-120-003
10. 472-120-006
11. 472-130-002

E. Street References: Northerly of Keller Road, southerly of Craig Road, bisected by Winchester Road and easterly of Abbot Road.

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description: portions of Sections 15 and 16, Township 6 South, Range 2 West

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The project site is relatively flat and has been previously graded. The site is currently vacant. Surrounding land uses include single family residences to the north and west and vacant/undeveloped land to the south and east.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

- 1. Land Use:** The project is consistent with the Highway 79 Policy Area requirements of the General Plan. The proposed project meets the requirements for Specific Plan land use designations and all applicable Specific Plan and General Plan land use policies.
- 2. Circulation:** The project will not impact overall trips to the area. Adequate circulation facilities exist and are proposed to serve the proposed project. The project is a minor clarification to the existing Specific Plan and will meet all applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.

3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** The project is a minor clarification to the existing Specific Plan and will meet all applicable Multipurpose Open Space element policies.
4. **Safety:** The project is a minor clarification to the existing Specific Plan and will meet all applicable Safety element policies.
5. **Noise:** The project is a minor clarification to the existing Specific Plan and will meet all applicable Noise element policies.
6. **Housing:** The project is a minor clarification to the existing Specific Plan and will meet all applicable Housing element policies.
7. **Air Quality:** The project is a minor clarification to the existing Specific Plan and will meet all applicable Air Quality Element policies.

B. General Plan Area Plan(s): Harvest Valley/Winchester and Southwest

C. Foundation Component(s): Community Development

D. Land Use Designation(s): Mixed Use (8-14 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Commercial Recreation; Commercial; Medium Density Residential (2-5 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Medium High Density Residential (5-8 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Low Density Residential (1-3 Dwelling Units Per Acre); Paseo/Greenbelt; Open Space; Golf; Parks; Schools; Circulation as reflected in the Land Use Plan.

E. Overlay(s), if any: Specific Plan Required

F. Policy Area(s), if any: Highway 79 Policy Area

G. Adjacent and Surrounding:

1. **Area Plan(s):** Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan and Sun City/Menifee Valley Area Plan
2. **Foundation Component(s):** Community Development, Rural, and Open Space
3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Low Density Residential (CD-LDR) (½ acre minimum), Medium Density Residential (CD-MDR) (2-5 dwelling units per acre), Medium High Density Residential (CD-MHDR) (5-8 dwelling units per acre), Light Industrial (LI) (0.25-0.60 floor area ratio), Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 floor area ratio), Open Space – Recreation (OS-R), and Open Space – Conservation (OS-C)
4. **Overlay(s) and Policy Area(s), if any:** Highway 79 Policy Area

H. Adopted Specific Plan Information

1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** Domenigoni-Barton Properties (SP 310)
2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** All

I. Existing Zoning: Domenigoni-Barton Properties Specific Plan (SP 310)

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: N/A

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Menifee Valley Ranch Specific Plan (SP301), Winchester Hills Specific Plan (SP293), Rural Residential (R-R), and One Family Dwelling (R-1)

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 type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input 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 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 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 **NOTHING FURTHER IS REQUIRED** because all potentially significant effects (a) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.
- 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

April 15, 2010

Date

Matt Straite

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421, Riverside County General Plan Figure C-9 "Scenic Highways"

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located adjacent to or within a scenic highway corridor. All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310. The project will be developed pursuant to the Specific Plan Standards and Guidelines and will not create an aesthetically offensive project.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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: GIS database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution), EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310. The project shall comply with lighting requirements of the Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 in conformance with EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

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

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

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?

b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

Source: Project Application Description, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

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?

b) Conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract (Riv. Co. Agricultural Land Conservation Contract Maps)?

c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?

d) Involve other changes in the existing environment 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, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421, and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact: Mitigation measures in the EIR address many aspects of agricultural mitigation. The project is currently farmed and contains Williamson Act contract lands. The contracts are permitted to continue until development occurs. Ord 625 notification is required for all perimeter development. The Substantial Conformance will not alter the impacts analyzed in the EIR. No additional mitigation is required. All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

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

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project

5. Air Quality Impacts

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

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)?

d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?

e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?

f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 6-2, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310. This project will not require any construction nor will the clarifications arising from the project impact the development in any way that was not addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: GIS database, WRCMSHCP, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact:

a) Although all potentially significant impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310, compliance with the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) should be further addressed.

The project proposes to accommodate the widening of SR 79. This will impact areas that were required to be dedicated to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) as habitat. These include Planning Area 18 which will be reduced 0.03 acres and a portion of the RCA dedication for Planning Area 32 will be reduced 0.15 acres. The total overall reduction to the RCA dedication *based on the road widening* of SR 79 is 0.18 acres total. The 0.18 acre reduction of the dedication has been analyzed by the County and because the impact is minimal in size and because the impact is being caused exclusively by the widening of SR 79 the impacts are considered less than significant. Impacts caused by this road widening have been anticipated by the MSHCP plan and are therefore consistent with the plan.

The project proposes two clarifications to open spaces. First, Planning Area 16 is a 12.5 acre area known as the Maze Stone Area, containing known areas of archeological significance. The project proposes to remove Planning Area 16 from the required RCA dedication. Inclusion of the area in conditions of approval and a mitigation measure that required dedication was based on a misinterpretation of Appendix M of Supplemental EIR 421 which shows the area, but does not call the area out as habitat or biological mitigation.

Second, a 2.9 acre portion of Planning Area 37 was also incorrectly added to a number of conditions and a mitigation measure for dedication to the RCA. When SP 310 was ultimately approved, the uses

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

designated for PA 37 were 15 acres of MDR and 5 acres of parkland. No habitat acreage was designated for PA 37 (see Specific Plan Land Use Plan Figure IV-1 and Land Use Table IV-1). In an attempt to ensure no net loss of biological acreage, besides road construction requirements, a condition of approval was added requiring that the 2.9 acres be relocated to be adjacent to the Southern Greenbelt. The location would have to be agreeable to the County and the Applicant prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

Section 3.3.1 of the MSHCP lists SP 310 among the approved projects determined to be consistent with the MSHCP, under the subheading "Criteria Review Consistency Prior to MSHCP Adoption". Specifically, the MSHCP says that SP 310's conservation of the 54.9-acre Southern Greenbelt contributes land to MSHCP Cells 5067, 5068, 5169 and 5170. The road widening will remove 0.15 acres from the Southern Greenbelt (in Planning Area 32), but the relocation of 2.9 acres from Planning area 37 will add to the total acreage overall.

Thus, the Northern Corridor Habitat area will now dedicate 80.97 acres and the Southern Greenbelt area will dedicate 57.65 acres to the RCA as permanent open space for conservation purposes, reserving an easement to access, maintain and operate existing wells and appurtenant facilities.

The project also proposes change based on County intersection spacing requirements that have been revised since the original Specific Plan was approved. In order to accommodate the appropriate intersection spacing along Scott Road and Washington Street several Planning area boundaries must be slightly altered. These alterations will increase some Planning Areas and decrease others. All adjustments will be made outside of required conservation and will only impact Planning Areas previously designated for development. No biological impacts will result.

In short, no new mitigation measures will be added, only one change to a mitigation measure is proposed to clarify an inconsistency. The only clarifications to Mitigation Measure Bio-3 will be the acreages due to the road widening, and to remove an area not intended for MSHCP biological mitigation. The revised Bio-3 Mitigation Measure will read-

"The 57.65 acre Southern Greenbelt area, the 83.9 Northern Corridor Habitat area, shall be conveyed as permanent open space for conservation purposes to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority ("RCA"). Conveyance of this property shall occur upon completion of grading activities on the project site and in any event no later than the issuance of the first building permit, whichever occurs first. Any potential temporary disturbance of these areas during Project grading (i.e., due to cut and fill, borrowing, vehicle movement, ect.) shall be reviewed and approved by the RCA. Any RCA approved temporary disturbance shall be revegetated with appropriate Riversidian sage scrub or other native species immediately upon completion of disturbance."

b-g) All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310. This project will not require any construction nor will the clarifications arising from the project impact the development in any way that was not addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

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: EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
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: Project Application Materials, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310. Many mitigation measures including Archeological and Tribal monitoring is required in conformance with the mitigation measures in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421. The project is proposing to clarify the ultimate responsibility of the Maze Stone Area (CA-RIV-1103, Planning Area 16). The Biological Mitigations required the area to be dedicated to the RCA. However, since the site was not designated as habitat by the EIR or the Conditions of Approval, the project proposes to transfer responsibility from the RCA to the land owner. Such an action remains consistent with all Cultural Mitigation Measures in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421. The EIR requires that the site be conserved as open space, left undisturbed, requires Phase II testing, and limited access including fencing and protective vegetation. EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 does not specify maintenance responsibility and this clarification does not alter or impact the Mitigation Measures in any way. The land owner will be responsible for all Mitigation and maintenance responsibility of the site.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further mitigation measures are required.

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

9. Paleontological Resources

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", EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310. All grading will be monitored by a qualified paleontologist in conformance with EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project

10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones

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?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, Geologist Comments, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310. In conformance with EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421, a Geologic Investigation was prepared for the proposed project. The study indicated the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone for active or potentially active faults. No evidence for faulting was discovered during the field investigation; the potential for surface fault rupture is considered low.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

11. Liquefaction Potential Zone

a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction", EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

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

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310. A geological investigation was prepared in conformance with the EIR. The GEO report concluded that the potential for seismically induced liquefaction on this site is considered low and will therefore have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

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), EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; a geological investigation was prepared in conformance with the EIR. The report concluded that the potential for surface fault rupture is low. The nearest active fault to the site is the San Jacinto Fault located about 9.8 miles to the east. The maximum credible earthquake for this fault is estimated to be 6.9 magnitude which could produce site accelerations in the range of .47g. California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to residential development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant in conformance with EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

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: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope", EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; a geological investigation was prepared in conformance with the EIR. Due to the lack of relief on this site and the absence of significant planned slopes, the potential for landsliding on this site is low.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

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

14. Ground Subsidence

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

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: EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; water wells shall be properly destroyed in conformance with EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

15. Other Geologic Hazards

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

a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?

Source: EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; a geological investigation was prepared in conformance with the EIR.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

16. Slopes

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

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

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

b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?

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

c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?

Source: RCIP figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slopes", Building and Safety – Grading Review, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: The project site is relatively flat and will not require an extensive amount of grading. All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

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

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: RCIP figure S-6 "Engineering Geologic Materials Map", EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421, Flood Control review, Building and Safety Grading review, application materials

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; a geological investigation was prepared in conformance with the EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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: EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

19. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.

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, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

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

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

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?

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?

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, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

21. Airports

a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?

b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?

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?

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?

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," GIS database, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: The project is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airport. All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility," GIS database, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: The project is not located within a high fire area. All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project

23. Water Quality Impacts

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

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?

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

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)?

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

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?

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

e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area,

<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
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; the proposed flood control facilities will be designed and constructed to Riverside County Flood Control's standards in compliance with the EIR.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; the project shall comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirement to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) in compliance with the EIR.

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

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

25. Land Use

a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?

Source: RCIP, GIS database, Project Application Materials, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; the project is consistent with the Domenigoni-Barton Properties Specific Plan (SP 310) zoning classification and the Medium Density Residential (MDR) (2-5 dwelling units per acre), Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) (5-8 dwelling units per acre), Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 floor area ratio), Open Space – Conservation (OS-C), and Open Space – Recreation (OS-R) land use designations. The project is adjacent to existing single family residential land uses. The proposed development will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the surrounding community. The project is located within the City of Menifee sphere of influence. The uses proposed in this project are similar to those proposed in the General Plan of the City of Menifee, and will not impact their land uses.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

26. Planning

a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?

b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?

c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?

d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?

e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS database, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

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

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310. The project is consistent with the Domenigoni-Barton Properties Specific Plan (SP 310) zoning classification and the Medium Density Residential (MDR) (2-5 dwelling units per acre), Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) (5-8 dwelling units per acre), Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 floor area ratio), Open Space – Conservation (OS-C), and Open Space – Recreation (OS-R) land use designations. The project is adjacent to existing single family residential land uses. The proposed development will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the surrounding community.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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", EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: The mineral resources element of the General Plan does not indicate the presence of resources on the project site. All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two				

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

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, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that would expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels. All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

29. Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", GIS database, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; the project site is located outside the recommended 100 foot setback from the railroad line.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

30. Highway Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Project Application Materials, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: The project is located adjacent to SR 79; all potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
31. Other Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/>				

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: No other noise sources have been identified near the project site that would contribute a significant amount of noise to the project; all potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

32. Noise Effects on or by the Project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

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

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; the original Specific Plan has been conditioned to comply with County Ordinance No. 659 in order to mitigate the potential effects to fire services in conformance with the EIR.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

35. Sheriff Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: RCIP, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; the original Specific Plan has been conditioned to comply with County Ordinance No. 659 in order to mitigate the potential effects to sheriff services in conformance with the EIR.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

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

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

36. Schools

Source: Romoland and Perris Union High School District correspondence, GIS database, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; the original Specific Plan is providing a school site and has been conditioned to comply with School Mitigation Impact fees in order to mitigate the potential effects to school services.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

37. Libraries

Source: RCIP, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; the original Specific Plan has been conditioned to comply with County Ordinance No. 659 in order to mitigate the potential effects to library services in conformance with the EIR.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

38. Health Services

Source: RCIP, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: The proposed project lies within the service parameters of several health care facilities; significant impacts are not anticipated. The EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310 did not require mitigation measures.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

RECREATION

39. Parks and Recreation

a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

40. Recreational Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: RCIP – Sun City/Meniffee Valley Area Plan figure 9 “Trails and Bikeway System”, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: No county designated trails are proposed on the site; all potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; a traffic impact study was submitted in accordance with County-approved guidelines in compliance with the EIR. The study indicated that it is possible to achieve adequate levels of service. The original Specific Plan has been conditioned to construct all necessary improvements to maintain the County service level standards in compliance with the EIR.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: RCIP, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: The project is not located adjacent to or nearby any designated bike trail; all potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

43. Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; the project will be served by Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) with existing facilities pursuant to the arrangement of financial agreements.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

44. Sewer

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?

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?

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; the project will be served by Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) with existing facilities pursuant to the arrangement of financial agreements.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

45. Solid Waste

a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?)

Source: RCIP, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

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

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

46. Utilities

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

Source: RCIP, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts were addressed in EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310; the project will comply with the requirements of Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas and Verizon to ensure that potential impacts to utility systems are reduced to a non-significant level in conformance with the EIR. In addition, the project will not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans.

Mitigation: No further mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring measures are required.

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 to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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. Mitigation measures have been incorporated to protect any biological resources that may potentially exist on the site

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

48. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one that occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The proposed project does not have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals. Both short-term and long-term environmental goals are being met through the mitigation placed on the project and the project design.

49. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15130)?

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. All cumulative impacts resulting from this project and those around it have been evaluated as part of this Initial Study, EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 prepared for Specific Plan No. 310.

50. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

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:

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

EIR No. 421 and Supplemental EIR No. 421 for Specific Plan No. 310 including all Appendices

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

Location: County of Riverside Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor
Riverside, CA 92505

C:\Documents and Settings\Matt\My Documents\hi work\Riv Co work\EA42296.doc
Revised: 3/15/10

ST CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

EVERY DEPARTMENT

10. EVERY. 1 SPSC - HOLD HARMLESS

RECOMMND

The applicant 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 the SPECIFIC PLAN. The COUNTY will promptly notify the subdivider 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 of any such claim, action, or proceeding or fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant shall not, thereafter, be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the COUNTY.

10. EVERY. 2 SPSC - SPSC DESCRIPTION

RECOMMND

This SPECIFIC PLAN SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE proposes to make the following minor alterations to the SPECIFIC PLAN:

The project is proposing a determination of Substantial Conformance for Specific Plan 310 resulting from:

1. Phases 1 and 2 of Riverside County's SR 79 road widening project from Station 165+64.937 to Station 252+50.
2. Clarifications to the open space acreage descriptions.
3. Changes to Planning Area configurations resulting from the County's desired minimum intersection spacing along Scott Road and Washington Street.

More detail is provided below.

1.Changes to Reflect County's SR 79 Road Widening Project:

The land use acreages for Specific Plan 310's Planning Areas were based upon a 184-foot right of way for SR 79. The right of way ultimately approved for the SR 79 road widening project and reflected in the Specific Plan 310 conditions of approval is 220 feet in width. Additionally, acreage outside of the right of way is required for slopes, drainage facilities, a water line easement and temporary construction easements for the current segment of the SR 79 road widening project that would have a minor impact on avoidance of passive open space acreage. As a result,

S JT CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 2

SPSC - SPSC DESCRIPTION (cont.)

RECOMMND

certain Planning Area boundaries and land use acreage numbers included in Specific Plan 310 Land Use Tables II-14 and IV-1, Board of Supervisors Resolution 2004-538 approving Specific Plan 310 at Section H.1 (page 29) and Section 3 (page 69), and conditions of approval, must be adjusted in connection with the County's SR 79 improvements, as follows:

Change the total acreage for Specific Plan from 1,734.5 acres to 1,713.52 acres, as set forth in Resolution 2004-538, section A, page 4;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 2 (Mixed Use) from 53.10 acres to 51.93 acres;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 3 (Comm. Rec.) from 70.80 acres to 70.71 acres;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 4 (Mixed Use) from 104.0 acres to 103 acres;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 18 (Open Space) from 45.3 acres to 45.27 acres; Planning Area 18 is part of the Northern Corridor Habitat MSHCP conservation dedication to the RCA.

Change the acreage of Planning Area 20 (Open Space/Golf Course) from 218.6 acres to 217.48 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 21 from 24.8 acres to 23.72 acres;

Change the acreage of Planning Area 24 (Commercial) from 8.6 acres to 7.83 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 25 (Comm. Rec.) from 47.10 acres to 46.86 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 26 (Commercial) from 10.20 acres to 9.17 acres (the Substantial Conformance

5 JT CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 2 SPSC - SPSC DESCRIPTION (cont.) (cont.) RECOMMND

proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 27 (Commercial) from 23.60 acres to 23.35 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes);

Change the acreage of Planning Area 32 (LDR) from 58.40 acres to 56.85 acres (the Substantial Conformance proposes additional acreage changes in Section 3 below, see Section 3 for total changes). A portion of Planning Area 32 is an MSHCP conservation dedication to the RCA. This change will impact the PA32 dedication by 0.15 acres, and the total Southern Greenbelt dedication (portions of PA31, 32, 28 and 29). However, the Substantial Conformance proposes additional clarifications to the Southern Greenbelt below, see Section 2 for total Southern Greenbelt changes).

The unit counts for each impacted Planning Area will remain the same. The actual dwelling unit range permitted by the Land Use Designation will accommodate the projected unit counts within all of the impacted Planning Areas without compromising the maximum dwelling units permitted by the designations of the PA's, thus remaining consistent with the Specific Plan without the need for modification, provided that the total number of approved residential dwelling units (4,186) shall not be exceeded. Additional language will be added to condition of approval 10.PLANNING.2 in the parent case to clarify the elements outlined above.

2.Changes to Clarify Descriptions of Open Space Areas:

Some of the Conditions of Approval, as approved in 2004, are non-substantially inconsistent with each other. This Substantial Conformance will clarify these inconsistencies.

There are two clarifications proposed with this Substantial Conformance.

A. Maze Stone Area (Planning Area 16)

The Maze Stone Area (12.5 acres) was incorrectly identified in the conditions for dedication to the RCA as part of the Northern Corridor Habitat area. EIR 421 and Supplemental EIR 421 did not require the Maze Stone Area for any biological mitigation. The Substantial Conformance

S JT CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 2 SPSC - SPSC DESCRIPTION (cont.) (cont.) (contRECOMMND

proposes that the area still be conserved as permanent open space by the applicant. The underlying biological and cultural mitigation obligations of SP 310 would not change.

All Maze Stone Area maintenance and mitigation responsibilities will be the responsibility of the applicant.

B. 2.9 Acres in Planning Area 37

In addition to the 12.5 Acre Maze Stone Area, this Substantial Conformance is proposing to relocate 2.9 acres of incorrectly identified RCA dedication, from Planning Area 37 to the Southern Greenbelt. When SP 310 was ultimately approved, the uses designated for PA 37 were 15 acres of MDR and 5 acres of parkland. No habitat acreage was designated for PA 37 (see Specific Plan Land Use Plan Figure IV-1 and Land Use Table IV-1). An alternative location for the 2.9 acres of habitat along the Southern Greenbelt shall be indentified prior to grading permit issuance in a location as agreed to by the County and the Applicant.

The habitat areas were correctly identified in Condition 30.Planning.42 as Planning Areas 18, 19, 28, 31 and 32. The Maze Stone Area and the 2.9 acres in PA 37 are not listed. However, conditions 30.Planning.46, 47 and 50 and Mitigation Measure Bio-3 incorrectly included these areas for dedication.

More specifically, conditions 30.Planning.46, 47 and 50 called for a 96.4-acre Northern Corridor Area to be dedicated to the RCA. These were based on Technical Appendix M which appeared to depict the Northern Corridor Area as:

12.5 acres in Planning Area 16 (the "Maze Stone Area" of SP 310);

45.3 acres in Planning Area 18;

35.7 acres in Planning Area 19; and

2.9 acres in Planning Area 37.

This Substantial Conformance proposes to clarify the descriptions of the Northern Corridor Habitat Area. All conditions and mitigation measure Bio-3 shall be revised to be consistent with 30.Planning.42.

The corrected acreage to be used in the conditions and mitigation measure Bio- 3 is calculated as follows:

ST CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 2 SPSC - SPSC DESCRIPTION (cont.) (cont.) (contRECOMMND

Northern Corridor Habitat area-

96.4 acres (total acreage of Northern Corridor Habitat area);

Minus 12.5 acres (Maze Stone area in PA 16 to be retained as permanent open space by the applicant);

Minus 2.9 acres (from the relocation of 2.9 acres from Planning Area 37)

Minus 0.03 acres (from Planning Area 18 due to road widening)

The total corrected northern corridor habitat area acreage to be dedicated to the RCA would be 80.97 acres.

Southern Greenbelt area-

54.9 acres (total acreage of southern greenbelt area as identified in the MSHCP Plan);

Minus 0.15 acres (for road dedication as identified in section 1 of this project description);

Plus 2.9 acres (relocated from Planning Area 37);

The total corrected southern greenbelt area acreage to be dedicated to the RCA would be 57.65 acres.

Section 3.3.1 of the MSHCP lists SP 310 among the approved projects determined to be consistent with the MSHCP, under the subheading "Criteria Review Consistency Prior to MSHCP Adoption". Specifically, the MSHCP says that SP 310's conservation of the 54.9-acre Southern Greenbelt contributes land to MSHCP Cells 5067, 5068, 5169 and 5170. The road widening will remove 0.15 acres from the Southern Greenbelt (in Planning Area 32), but the relocation of 2.9 acres from Planning area 37 will add to the total acreage overall. Through this Substantial Conformance the County determines that the revised overall acreage (57.65 acres) of the Southern Greenbelt resulting from the SR 79 road widening and the relocation of 2.9 acres to the greenbelt is consistent with, beneficial to, and does not conflict with, the MSHCP.

Thus, the Northern Corridor Habitat area will now dedicate 80.97 acres and the Southern Greenbelt area will dedicate 57.65 acres to the RCA as permanent open space for conservation purposes, reserving an easement to access, maintain and operate existing wells and appurtenant facilities.

The Substantial Conformance also proposes to reflect the

ST CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 2 SPSC - SPSC DESCRIPTION (cont.) (cont.) (contRECOMMND

corrected RCA dedication acreage in the following documents in order to maintain consistency:

Page II-E-6, Mitigation Measure BIO-3 and Appendix M of Supplemental EIR 421 (all done through Appendix No. 1 to the EIR);

Page 70 of Resolution 2004-538; and
Conditions of Approval No. 30. PLANNING. 46, 47 and 50.

3.Changes to Accommodate County's Intersection Spacing on Scott Road and Washington Street:

Following approval of SP 310, the County TLMA established desired minimum intersection spacing along Scott Road and Washington Street for full movement intersections at 1,320 feet, and for right in/right out movement intersections at 660 feet. Additionally, the second full movement intersection westerly from SR 79 to the westerly line of Planning Area 23 and Planning Area 36 shall be 1,203 feet instead of 1,320 feet. The configurations of Planning Areas abutting Scott Road and Washington Street would be adjusted slightly in order to best achieve the County's desired minimum intersection spacing. The changes in acreage resulting from the changes in Planning Area configurations are summarized below. The acreages for Planning Areas 20, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 32 reflect combined changes due to SR 79 road widening and Scott Road/Washington Street intersection spacing. The total number of approved residential dwelling units (4,186) shall not be exceeded. Additionally, to remain consistent with the DEIR and the SEIR, any increases in Planning Areas will only accommodate additional access. No increase in density or uses shall be permitted.

Planning Area 20 (Open Space/Golf) decreased from 217.48 acres to 216.08 acres for an overall decrease of 1.4 acres.

Planning Area 22 (Medium/High Density Residential) decreased from 46.4 acres to 40.84 acres for an overall decrease of 5.56 acres.

Planning Area 23 (Medium/High Density Residential) increased from 21.7 acres to 27.34 acres for an overall increase of 5.64 acres.

Planning Area 24 (Commercial) increased from 7.83 acres to

ST CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 2 SPSC - SPSC DESCRIPTION (cont.) (cont.) (contRECOMMND

12.06 acres for an overall increase of 4.23 acres.

Planning Area 25 (Commercial/Recreation) increased from 46.86 acres to 50.0 acres for an overall increase of 3.14 acres.

Planning Area 26 (Commercial) increased from 9.17 acres to 16.95 acres for an overall increase of 7.78 acres.

Planning Area 27 (Commercial) decreased from 23.35 acres to 16.09 acres for an overall decrease of 7.26 acres.

Planning Area 28 (Commercial/Recreation) increased from 54.7 acres to 55.07 acres for an overall increase of 0.37 acres.

Planning Area 29 (Medium Density Residential) increased from 62.1 acres to 62.84 acres for an overall increase of 0.74 acres.

Planning Area 31 (Low Density Residential) increased from 41.2 acres to 42.58 acres for an overall increase of 1.38 acres.

Planning Area 32 (Low Density Residential) increased from 56.85 acres to 61.94 acres for an overall increase of 5.09 acres.

Planning Area 33 (Medium Density Residential) increased from 18.6 acres to 19.56 acres for an overall increase of 0.96 acres.

Planning Area 35 (Mixed Use) increased from 10.1 acres to 10.82 acres for an overall increase of 0.72 acres.

Planning Area 36 (Mixed Use) decreased from 33.6 acres to 27.17 acres for an overall decrease of 6.43.

In total the Planning area Boundaries will be shifting; however these will not require revisions to the overall Specific Plan boundaries and all revisions will be in substantial conformance with the original approved Specific Plan.

S ST CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

10.PLANNING. 1 SPSC - SEE MAIN CASE SP00310

RECOMMND

All implimenting projects must be attached to SP00310. This Substantial Conformance case will be locked after approval.

10.PLANNING. 2 SPSC - ACCESS LIMITATION

RECOMMND

Substantial Conformance No. 1 permitted minor corrections (for complete details see the project description) to Planning Area boundaries due to revisions in County intersection spacing requirements. Any changes to Planning Area limits to accommodate County changes in intersection spacing requirements along Scott Road and Washington Street shall not permit an increase or decrease in density or uses within Planning areas regardless of permitted uses. All increases in Planning Area boundaries shall be to accommodate access only.

*This condition of approval was added as a result of Specific Plan Substantial Conformance No. 1 approved by the Board of Supervisors on _____, 2010.

**These conditions have been entered into the Substantial Conformance as a placeholder. If approved the conditions will be altered or moved to the original parent SPECIFIC PLAN. Conditions numbers will change as a result. Please leave these in the Substantial Conformance to correlate with the environmental documentation. This should be deleted from the Condition once moved to the parent SPECIFIC PLAN.

10.PLANNING. 3 SPSC - REVISED LAND USE MAP

RECOMMND

Substantial Conformance No. 1 permitted minor corrections (for complete details see the project description) to Planning Area boundaries due to revisions in County intersection spacing requirements. Prior to approval of any implementing project 20 full color 11"x17" copies of a revised Land Use Plan shall be submitted to the County Planning Department for inclusion in previously approved final SPECIFIC PLAN documents and the Planning Web Page, if and where appropriate.

*This condition of approval was added as a result of Specific Plan Substantial Conformance No. 1 approved by the Board of Supervisors on _____, 2010.

ST CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 3

SPSC - REVISED LAND USE MAP (cont.)

RECOMMND

**These conditions have been entered into the Substantial Conformance as a placeholder. If approved the conditions will be altered or moved to the original parent SPECIFIC PLAN. Conditions numbers will change as a result. Please leave these in the Substantial Conformance to correlate with the environmental documentation. This should be deleted from the Condition once moved to the parent SPECIFIC PLAN.

10.PLANNING. 4

SPSC - REVISED 10.PLANNING.2

RECOMMND

Density transfers between Planning Areas within the SPECIFIC PLAN shall not be permitted, except through the Specific Plan Amendment process.

In this SPECIFIC PLAN, each Planning Area (PA) has a "Target" unit count. Each PA also has a Land Use Designation Range.

The Target unit count is a carefully created estimate used to create a total dwelling unit number for the entire SPECIFIC PLAN. However, the target for each PA does not limit the number of dwelling units in a PA. A PA is permitted to build over the Target density so long as the PA total unit count does not exceed the top of its Land Use Designation range.

In no case shall the SPECIFIC PLAN maximum total permitted residential dwelling units (4,186) be exceeded.

*This condition of approval was augmented as a result of Specific Plan Substantial Conformance No. 1 approved by the Board of Supervisors on _____, 2010.

**This condition has been entered into the Substantial Conformance as a placeholder. If approved the conditions will be altered or moved to the original parent SPECIFIC PLAN. Conditions numbers will change as a result. Please leave this condition in the Substantial Conformance to correlate with the environmental documentation. This should be deleted from the Condition once moved to the parent SPECIFIC PLAN.

04/26/10
11:52

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 10

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

30.PLANNING. 5

SPSC - REVISED 30.PLANNING.46

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following conditions shall be placed on the implementing project:

"70.PLANNING.?? SP - MSHCP CONDITION #2

As agreed to by the Applicant, in excess of the requirements of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, the 57.65 acre (as revised by Substantial Conformance No. 1) Southern Greenbelt area shall be offered for dedication to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) and accepted by the RCA upon completion of any grading activities on the project site and in any event no later than issuance of the first building permit, whichever occurs first.

The Northern Corridor Habitat area, consisting of 80.97 acres (which includes Planning areas 18, and 19, as revised by Substantial Conformance No. 1), shall be offered for dedication to the RCA and accepted by the RCA upon completion of any grading activities on the project site and in any event no later than issuance of the first building permit, whichever occurs first.

Prior to acceptance of the offer of dedication by the RCA, the Applicant shall submit a preliminary title report and Phase 1 Environmental Assessment for the dedication acreage, to the RCA for its review and approval. The RCA shall have the sole and absolute discretion with respect to the approval of the information contained in the preliminary title report and Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment. Title to the dedication acreage shall be free and clear of all liens, encumbrances, easements, leases (recorded and unrecorded) and taxes except those encumbrances and easements, which in the sole discretion of the RCA are acceptable. Easements allowing for the management of fuel modification areas or detention basins shall not be accepted. Any re-vegetation of these areas to comply with mitigation measures for the project shall be approved by the RCA. This condition shall be considered MET if Condition of Approval No. 80.PLANNING.?? SP - MSHCP CONDITION #2 is satisfied.

04/26/10
11:52

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 11

ST CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 5

SPSC - REVISED 30.PLANNING.46 (cont.)

RECOMMND

*This condition of approval was augmented as a result of Specific Plan Substantial Conformance No. 1 approved by the Board of Supervisors on _____, 2010."

"80.PLANNING.?? SP - MSHCP CONDITION #2

As agreed to by the Applicant, in excess of the requirements of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, the 57.65 acre (as revised by Substantial Conformance No. 1) Southern Greenbelt area shall be offered for dedication to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) and accepted by the RCA upon completion of any grading activities on the project site and in any event no later than issuance of the first building permit, whichever occurs first.

The Northern Corridor Habitat area, consisting of 80.97 acres (which includes Planning areas 18, and 19, as revised by Substantial Conformance No. 1), shall be offered for dedication to the RCA and accepted by the RCA upon completion of any grading activities on the project site and in any event no later than issuance of the first building permit, whichever occurs first.

Prior to acceptance of the offer of dedication by the RCA, the Applicant shall submit a preliminary title report and Phase 1 Environmental Assessment for the dedication acreage, to the RCA for its review and approval. The RCA shall have the sole and absolute discretion with respect to the approval of the information contained in the preliminary title report and Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment. Title to the dedication acreage shall be free and clear of all liens, encumbrances, easements, leases (recorded and unrecorded) and taxes except those encumbrances and easements, which in the sole discretion of the RCA are acceptable. Easements allowing for the management of fuel modification areas or detention basins shall not be accepted. Any re-vegetation of these areas to comply with mitigation measures for the project shall be approved by the RCA. This condition shall be considered MET if Condition of Approval No. 70.PLANNING.?? SP - MSHCP CONDITION #2 is satisfied.

ST CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 5 SPSC - REVISED 30.PLANNING.46 (cont.) (cont.)RECOMMND

*This condition of approval was augmented as a result of Specific Plan Substantial Conformance No. 1 approved by the Board of Supervisors on _____, 2010."

**This condition has been entered into the Substantial Conformance as a placeholder. If approved the conditions will be altered or moved to the original parent SPECIFIC PLAN. Conditions numbers will change as a result. Please leave this condition in the Substantial Conformance to correlate with the environmental documentation. This should be deleted from the Condition once moved to the parent SPECIFIC PLAN.

30.PLANNING. 6 SPSC - REVISED 30.PLANNING.47 RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"80.PLANNING.?? SP - MSHCP CONDITION #3

Prior to issuance of a grading permit, any potential temporary disturbance of either the 57.65 acre (as revised by Substantial Conformance No. 1) Southern Greenbelt area or the 80.97 acre Northern Corridor Habitat area dedication, caused by proposed project grading (i.e. due to cut and fill, borrowing, or vehicle movement), shall be reviewed and approved by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA). Any RCA approved temporary disturbance of these areas shall be revegetated with appropriate Riversidean sage scrub or other native species as determined by the RCA immediately upon completion of the disturbance. Furthermore, any re-contouring of the existing, irrigation runoff-dominated drainage in Planning Areas 13 and 20 which may affect the 80.97 acre northern corridor habitat area shall be approved by the RCA.

*This condition of approval was augmented as a result of Specific Plan Substantial Conformance No. 1 approved by the Board of Supervisors on _____, 2010."

**This condition has been entered into the Substantial Conformance as a placeholder. If approved the conditions will be altered or moved to the original parent SPECIFIC

04/26/10
11:52

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 13

ST CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 6 SPSC - REVISED 30.PLANNING.47 (cont.) RECOMMND

PLAN. Conditions numbers will change as a result. Please leave this condition in the Substantial Conformance to correlate with the environmental documentation. This should be deleted from the Condition once moved to the parent SPECIFIC PLAN.

30.PLANNING. 7 SPSC - REVISED 30.PLANNING.50 RECOMMND

All implementing projects within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), shall be reviewed for compliance with the following:
Approximately 1200 linear feet (0.442 acres) of riparian scrub located in Planning Areas 25 and 28 shall be avoided. Additionally, approximately 3.5 acres of alkali playa located in the 57.65 acre (as revised by Substantial Conformance No. 1) Southern Greenbelt shall be avoided and no temporary disturbance of this habitat shall be authorized. If deemed necessary, a 60. series condition shall be created for the implement project to ensure that subsequent grading plans show that the above-described areas will be avoided.

*This condition of approval was augmented as a result of Specific Plan Substantial Conformance No. 1 approved by the Board of Supervisors on _____, 2010.

**This condition has been entered into the Substantial Conformance as a placeholder. If approved the conditions will be altered or moved to the original parent SPECIFIC PLAN. Conditions numbers will change as a result. Please leave this condition in the Substantial Conformance to correlate with the environmental documentation. This should be deleted from the Condition once moved to the parent SPECIFIC PLAN.

30.PLANNING. 8 SPSC - 2.9 AC GRNBLT ADDITION RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"60.PLANNING.XX SP- 2.9 AC GRNBLT ADDITION

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit within the SPECIFIC PLAN the location of 2.9 Acres of land, contiguous

04/26/10
11:52

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 14

ST CONFORMANCE - SP Case #: SP00310S1

Parcel: 466-160-013

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 8

SPSC - 2.9 AC GRNBLT ADDITION (cont.)

RECOMMND

to the Southern Greenbelt as identified on the Land Use Plan, shall be agreed to by the County and the Applicant. This acreage is considered part of 57.65 acre Southern Greenbelt identified in condition 30.PLANNING.46, 30.PLANNING.47, and 30.PLANNING.50. This condition cannot be differed.

*This condition of approval was added as a result of Specific Plan Substantial Conformance No. 1 approved by the Board of Supervisors on _____, 2010."

**This condition has been entered into the Substantial Conformance as a placeholder. If approved the conditions will be altered or moved to the original parent SPECIFIC PLAN. Conditions numbers will change as a result. Please leave this condition in the Substantial Conformance to correlate with the environmental documentation. This should be deleted from the Condition once moved to the parent SPECIFIC PLAN.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY
Planning Department
Ron Goldman · Planning Director

**REQUEST FOR DETERMINATION OF SUBSTANTIAL
CONFORMANCE WITH A SPECIFIC PLAN**

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

CASE NUMBER: SP0031051 DATE SUBMITTED: February 18, 2010

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant's Name: Domienizoni - Barton Properties, c/o Andy and Cindy Domienizoni
~~Please see attachment #1~~ E-Mail: sky.canyon@verizon.net

Mailing Address: 31851 Winchester Road
Winchester CA 92596
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (951) 926-6924 Fax No: (951) 926-4924

Engineer/Representative's Name: John Vanderelst Contact E-Mail: jvanderelst@aei-case.com

Mailing Address: AEI-CASE CONSULTING 931 S. Via Lata, Suite 500
Colton CA 92324
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (909) 783-0101 x1620 Fax No: (909) 783-0108

Property Owner's Name: SEE ATTACHMENT 1 E-Mail: sky.canyon@verizon.net

Mailing Address: 31851 Winchester Road
Winchester CA 92596
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (951) 926-6924 Fax No: (951) 926-4924

If the property is owned by more than one person, attach a separate page that reference the application case number and lists the names, mailing addresses, and phone numbers of all persons having an interest in the real property or properties involved in this application.

The Planning Department will primarily direct communications regarding this application to the person identified above as the Applicant. The Applicant may be the property owner, representative, or other assigned agent.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONCURRENT FEE TRANSFER

The signature below authorizes the Planning Department and TLMA to expedite the refund and billing process by transferring monies among concurrent applications to cover processing costs as necessary.

Riverside Office· 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor
P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, California 92502-1409
(951) 955-3200· Fax (951) 955-3157
Form 295-1058 (02/27/08)

Desert Office· 38686 El Cerrito Road
Palm Desert, California 92211
(760) 863-8277· Fax (760) 863-7555

Murrieta Office· 39493 Los Alamos Road.
Murrieta, California 92563
· Fax (951) 600-6145

REQUEST FOR DETERMINATION OF SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE WITH A SPECIFIC PLAN

Fees collected in excess of the actual cost of providing specific services will be refunded. If additional funds are needed to complete the processing of your application, you will be billed, and processing of the application will cease until the outstanding balance is paid and sufficient funds are available to continue the processing of the application. The applicant understands the deposit fee process as described above, and that there will be NO refund of fees which have been expended as part of the application review or other related activities or services, even if the application is withdrawn or the application is ultimately denied.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

Cindy Domenigoni

PRINTED NAME OF APPLICANT

Cindy Domenigoni

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

Andy Domenigoni

AUTHORITY FOR THIS APPLICATION IS HEREBY GIVEN:

I certify that I am/we are the record owner(s) or authorized agent and that the information filed is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner's behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

Andy Domenigoni

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

Andy Domenigoni

SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

Cindy Domenigoni

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

Cindy Domenigoni

SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

If the subject property is owned by persons who have not signed as owners above, attach a separate sheet that references the application case number and lists the printed names and signatures of all persons having an interest in the property.

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Description of Substantial Conformance Request (Reference the existing Planning Area(s), and/or Policies, and/or Conditions that are proposed to be modified, and clearly state the proposed modifications) (if lengthy, extra pages may be attached):

Please see attachment #2

PROPERTY OWNERS CERTIFICATION FORM

I, VINNIE NGUYEN, certify that on 3/1/2010.

The attached property owners list was prepared by Riverside County GIS,

APN (s) or case numbers SPO031031 For

Company or Individual's Name Planning Department,

Distance buffered 600' 1000.

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

✓ 3/2/2010 CA
EXPIRES: 2/2/2010

1000 feet buffer



Selected parcel(s):

466-070-028	466-150-005	466-160-007	466-160-013	466-170-032	466-250-014	466-250-015
466-250-016	466-250-017	466-250-021	466-250-022	466-260-007	466-360-035	472-100-007
472-100-009	472-100-010	472-100-015	472-110-003	472-110-011	472-110-012	472-110-013
472-110-014	472-110-016	472-110-017	472-110-018	472-110-019	472-110-020	472-110-021
			472-110-026			

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...02/26/2010

APN: 466070028 ASMT: 466070028
MWD
C/O ASSEST MANAGEMENT
P O BOX 54153
LOS ANGELES CA 90054

APN: 466150005 ASMT: 466150005
WINCHESTER WESSELINK
32605 HOLLAND RD
WINCHESTER CA 92596

APN: 466160007 ASMT: 466160007
ANDY R DOMENIGONI
CINDY G DOMENIGONI
31851 WINCHESTER RD
WINCHESTER CA. 92596

APN: 466160013 ASMT: 466160013
CRAIG 435
C/O DOMENIGONI BARTON PROP MGMT
3301 HOLLAND RD
WINCHESTER CA 92596

APN: 466170032 ASMT: 466170032
FRANCIS DOMENIGONI
C/O CINDY DOMENIGONI
31851 WINCHESTER RD
WINCHESTER CA 92596

APN: 466250014 ASMT: 466250014
VENTOURE JENNINGS
LINDA JENNINGS
32620 ASHFORD LN
WINCHESTER CA 92596

APN: 466250015 ASMT: 466250015
STEVEN J HARRIMAN
CATHY C HARRIMAN
31556 RAILROAD CYN RD
CANYON LAKE CA 92587

APN: 466250016 ASMT: 466250016
STEVEN J HARRISON
NORMA LAVIE
ANITA MATTESON
ELIZABETH DIAZ
31556 RAILROAD CANYON RD
CANYON LAKE CA 92587

APN: 466250017 ASMT: 466250017
HUB ENTERPRISES
C/O HUB ENTERPRISES
29826 HAUN RD STE 305
MENIFEE CA 92586

APN: 466250021 ASMT: 466250021
JOHN ANDREW LONG
32520 ASHFORD
WINCHESTER CA 92596

APN: 466250022 ASMT: 466250022
JACOB ARONOWICZ
JOSEPHINE R ARONOWICZ
C/O ELANA EVIDA
9010 E FOOTHILLS DR
SCOTTSDALE AZ 85255

APN: 466260007 ASMT: 466260007
NABIL RAJAB MUHTASEB
NAYEF RAJAB MUHTASEB
GHAZI RAJAB MUHTASEB
1666 MEDICAL CENTER NO 3
SAN BERNARDINO CA 92411

APN: 466360035 ASMT: 466360035
STIEFEL FAMILY
32750 HOLLAND RD
WINCHESTER CA. 92596

APN: 472100007 ASMT: 472100007
BETTY LEE BENTLEY
LEROY E CHRISTENSEN
KARL A LANG
VERNA I LANG
C/O WESTBERG INV CORP
3730 E BROADWAY STE C
LONG BEACH CA 90803



APN: 472100009 ASMT: 472100009
DIANE E LEADING
SYLVIA M GRAY
BRETT M LEADING
P O BOX 682
WINCHESTER CA 92596

APN: 472100010 ASMT: 472100010
DOMENIGONI FRANCIS FAM TRUST
33011 HOLLAND RD
WINCHESTER CA 92596

APN: 472100015 ASMT: 472100015
ANDY DOMENIGONI
DONALD DOMENIGONI
CINDY DOMENIGONI
STEVEN DALE DOMENIGONI, ETAL.
C/O JEAN DOMENIGONI
31851 WINCHESTER RD
WINCHESTER CA 92596

APN: 472110003 ASMT: 472110003
VIOLET B HANNA
DAVID W HANNA
C/O HANNA CAPITAL MAN
8105 IRVINE CENTER 1170
IRVINE CA 92618

APN: 472110011 ASMT: 472110011
DOMENIGONI BARTON PROP
33011 HOLLAND RD
WINCHESTER CA 92526

APN: 472110012 ASMT: 472110012
THOMAS LEAMAN
25933 GOLD BEACH DR
VASHON WA 98070

APN: 472110013 ASMT: 472110013
JOHN STEVEN HELLIESEN
WYONA YVONNE HELLIESEN
1121 PINTO DR
LA HABRA HTS CA 90631

APN: 472110014 ASMT: 472110014
SUNG JOON KIM
27 MAUCHLY STE 206
IRVINE CA 92618

APN: 472110016 ASMT: 472110016
ANN R CHAPPELOW
2470 UNICORNIO ST
LA COSTA CA 92009

APN: 472110017 ASMT: 472110017
RONALD E SHOFFEITT
PATRICIA K SHOFFEITT
P O BOX 1522
TEMECULA CA 92593

APN: 472110018 ASMT: 472110018
ROBERT COBBS
33695 WASHINGTON RD
WINCHESTER CA. 92596

APN: 472110019 ASMT: 472110019
ANH N NGUYEN
HUYEN N TRAN
2787 HUFF DRIVE
PLEASANTON CA 94588

APN: 472110020 ASMT: 472110020
MORALEZ ENTERPRISES
C/O PAUL MORALEZ
38253 VIA MAJORCA
MURRIETA CA 92562

APN: 472110021 ASMT: 472110021
WIMBLEY COURT
C/O JEFFERY LEE
P O BOX 56432
SHERMAN OAKS CA 91403



APN: 472110026 ASMT: 472110026
GEORGIA A COSTELLO
32750 KELLER RD
WINCHESTER CA 92596

Domenigoni Barton Properties
C/O Andy & Cindi Domenigoni
31851 Winchester Road
Winchester CA 92596

John Vanderelst
AEI-CASC Consulting
937 South Via Lata, Suite 500
Colton CA 92324

Michele A. Staples, Esq.
Jackson, DeMarco, Tidus, & Peckenpaugh
2030 Main Street, Suite 1200
Irvine, CA 92614

Domenigoni Barton Properties
C/O Andy & Cindi Domenigoni
31851 Winchester Road
Winchester CA 92596

John Vanderelst
AEI-CASC Consulting
937 South Via Lata, Suite 500
Colton CA 92324

Michele A. Staples, Esq.
Jackson, DeMarco, Tidus, & Peckenpaugh
2030 Main Street, Suite 1200
Irvine, CA 92614

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.

Specific Plan No. 310, Substantial Conformance No. 1 and Environmental Assessment No. 42296

Project Title/Case Numbers

Matt Straite 951-955-8631
County Contact Person Phone Number

N/A
State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to the State Clearinghouse)


Domenigoni Barton Properties 31851 Winchester Road Winchester CA 92596
Project Applicant Address

Unincorporated Western Riverside County, Winchester and French Valley Area Plans; northerly of Keller Road, southerly of Craig Road, bisected by Winchester Road and easterly of Abbot Road.
Project Location

The Substantial Conformance proposes modifications to the Specific Plan resulting from the widening of Highway 79, clarifications of open spaces and revised Transportation intersection spacing requirements.
Project Description

This is to advise that the Riverside County Planning Commission, as the lead agency, has approved the above-referenced project on May 5, 2010, and has made the following determinations regarding that project:

1. The project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment.
 2. An Addendum to an earlier EIR was prepared for the project pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (\$64.00).
1. To certify that the earlier EIR, 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
Project Planner 5/11/10

Date Received for Filing and Posting at OPR: _____

Revised on 3/15/10 by R. Juarez
Y:\Planning Master Forms\Templates\CEQA Forms\NOD Form.doc

Please charge deposit fee case#: ZEA42296 ZCFG No. 05681 - County Clerk Posting Fee
FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY