

Engineers and a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

- e. The County shall encourage the use of pervious materials in development to retain absorption and allow more percolation of stormwater into the ground. The use of pervious materials, such as grass, permeable/porous pavement, etc., for runoff channels and parking areas shall also be encouraged. Lining runoff channels with impermeable surfaces, such as concrete or grouted riprap, will be discouraged.
- f. The County shall encourage construction of detention basins or holding ponds and/or constructed wetlands within a project site to capture and treat dry weather urban runoff and the first flush of rainfall runoff. These basins should be designed to detain runoff for a minimum time, such as 24 hours, to allow particles and associated pollutants to settle and to provide for natural treatment.
- g. The County shall encourage development to retain areas of open space as natural or landscaped to aid in the recharge and retention of runoff. Native plant materials shall be used in replanting and hydroseeding operations, where feasible.
- h. The County shall require that environmental documents for proposed projects in areas tributary to Canyon Lake Reservoir, Lake Elsinore, sections of the Santa Ana River, Fulmar Lake, and Mill Creek (as a result of the proposed 2002 303 (d) listing of these waterbodies) include discharge prohibitions, revisions to discharge permits, or management plans to address water quality impacts in accordance with the controls that may be applied pursuant to state and federal regulation. Environmental documents shall acknowledge that additional requirements may be imposed in the future for projects in areas tributary to the water bodies listed above.
- i. The County shall ensure that in new development, post-development stormwater runoff flow rates do not differ from the pre-development stormwater runoff flow rates.

- j. All construction projects should be designed and implemented to protect, and if at all possible, to improve the quality of the underlying groundwater.
- k. The County shall encourage the enhancement of groundwater recharge wherever possible. Measures such as keeping stream/river channels and floodplains in natural conditions or with pervious surfaces, as well as keeping areas of high recharge as open space will be considered.
- l. The County shall prohibit the discharge of waste material resulting from any type of construction into any drainage areas, channels, streambeds, streams, lakes, wetlands or rivers. Spoil sites shall be prohibited within any streams or areas where spoil material could be washed into a water body.
- m. The County shall require that appropriate BMPs be developed and implemented during construction efforts to control the discharge of pollutants, prevent sewage spills, and to avoid discharge of sediments into the streets, stormwater conveyance channels or waterways."

With the implementation of applicable County, State and federal regulations, ordinances, existing and proposed General Plan policies and Mitigation Measures listed above, GPA No. 960 would have less than significant impacts on water quality.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.19-303 through 4.19-308

2. Impacts: (Impact 4.19.D) Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements

Future development accommodated by the land use and policy changes proposed by the Project has the potential to result in alterations to existing hydrology, increases in impervious surfaces and increases in urban runoff. If not properly managed and controlled, urbanization may change stream hydrology and increase pollutant loading to receiving waters. Such changes would increase the discharge of pollutants into receiving waters if not properly managed and controlled. Future development accommodated by GPA No. 960 would be required to demonstrate compliance with the Clean Water Act, Clean Water Act Section 402 (National Pollutant Discharge

1 Elimination System), the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, as well as the California
2 Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1970. Further, several General Plan
3 regulations would prevent or reduce significant violations of water quality standards
4 or waste discharge requirements, and can be referenced on page 4.19-310. Several
5 General Plan policies address impacts to water quality standards, including new
6 Policies OS 3.4 through 3.7, which address requirements to comply with NPDES and
7 other regulations addressing pollution discharges and runoff to protect stormwater
8 quality and, ultimately surface and groundwater fed by stormwater runoff, as well as
9 Policies LU 9.1, 9.2, and 9.4, which address protection of wetlands and other riparian
10 resources from hydrological disruption, protect water quality within floodplains and
11 drainages, and minimize erosion effects. Further, applicable mitigation would reduce
12 impacts through requiring the implementation of BMP's by contractors, regulating
13 the construction of septic systems, monitoring of point source pollution, requiring
14 projects that may worsen water quality to prepare a water quality analysis, and
15 requiring proof of completion of measures contained within the water quality
16 analysis. Thus, compliance with the abovementioned existing laws, federal, State and
17 County regulatory programs, ordinances, General Plan policies and mitigation
18 measures, are necessary to ensure that this impact is less than significant.

19 Mitigation:

20 In addition to the below specific mitigation measures from EIR No. 441 that address
21 wastewater treatment issues directly, existing Mitigation Measure 4.10.9A (also
22 below) would also aid in reducing wastewater impacts. Existing Mitigation Measure
23 4.17.5E (refer to the discussion for Impact 4.19.C, above) is also applicable to this
24 impact, and would also aid in reducing wastewater impacts.

25 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.10.9A states, "The County, where required, and in
26 accordance with issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
27 (NPDES) permit, to require the construction and/or grading contractor for individual
28

1 developments to establish and implement specific Best Management Practices (BMPs)
2 at time of project implementation.”

3 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.5A states, “The development of septic systems shall
4 be in accordance with applicable standards established by Riverside County and other
5 responsible authorities.”

6 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.5B states, “Point source pollution reduction
7 programs shall fully adhere to applicable standards required by federal, state and
8 local agencies. Prior to the approval of individual projects, Riverside County shall
9 verify that the provisions of applicable point source pollution programs have been
10 satisfied.”

11 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.5C states, “A water quality analysis shall be prepared
12 where development may contribute to a worsening of local or regional ground or
13 surface water quality (as determined by the Riverside County Department of
14 Environmental Health and/or RWQCB). The water quality analysis shall include (but
15 shall not be limited to): an analysis of existing surface and subsurface water quality;
16 an assessment of how the proposed development would affect existing water quality;
17 an assessment of how the proposed development would affect beneficial uses of the
18 water; and specific measures to limit or eliminate potential water quality impacts
19 and/or impacts to beneficial uses of ground/surface water. Where determined
20 necessary by the County or other responsible entity, the water quality analysis shall
21 include, at an equal level of detail, potential impacts to tributary or downstream
22 areas. The water quality analysis shall be submitted to the County and the RWQCB for
23 review and shall be approved prior to the issuance of any entitlement that would
24 result in the physical modification of the project site.”

25 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.5D states, “The project applicant shall submit to the
26 County and the RWQCB, for review and approval, evidence that the specific measures
27 to limit or eliminate potential water quality impacts resulting from the entire
28 development process, will be implemented as set forth in the water quality analysis.

1 Said evidence shall be submitted and approved prior to the issuance of any
2 entitlement that would result in the physical modification of the project site."

3 Compliance with applicable County, State, and federal regulations in addition to
4 existing and proposed General Plan policies and existing Mitigation Measures, ensures
5 that GPA No. 960 would have a less than significant impact on water quality.

6 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.19-308 through 4.19-313

7 3. Impacts: (Impact 4.19.E) Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements

8 Future development accommodated by the land use and policy changes proposed by
9 the Project has the potential to increase the amount of people and structures
10 generating wastewater. Wastewater requires proper treatment to ensure it does not
11 adversely affect receiving waters, for example, by elevating pollutant levels or
12 introducing pathogens. Receiving waters are protected through Riverside County's
13 compliance with and enforcement of its NPDES MS4 permits, as well as other permits
14 required for a wide variety of activities with potential to discharge wastes into Waters
15 of the State or U.S. These include construction and operational activities, operation of
16 MS4s (municipal separate storm sewer systems) and industries that produce
17 wastewater. Compliance with the NPDES permit requirements, the Clean Water Act,
18 California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1970, and CCR Title 22
19 (Recycled Water) would aid to ensure the Project complies with wastewater
20 treatment requirements. Further, there are several existing Riverside County
21 regulations that would apply to development accommodated by GPA No. 960 and
22 would contribute to ensuring the Project's compliance with wastewater treatment
23 requirements. Refer to page 4.19-315 for a full description of these regulations.
24 Future development accommodated by GPA No. 960 would also be subject to Policies
25 OS 3.1 through 3.3, which address wastewater treatment and protection of water
26 quality through compliance with various pollution discharge standards, as well as
27 Policies LU 5.3, 21.2, 28.3, 29.7, 30.7, 31.4 and 32.6, which address project
28 consistency with urban water management plans and require projects be reviewed to

1 ensure water resources and infrastructure are adequate for the proposed level of
2 development. Further, applicable mitigation (as discussed in Impact 4.19C) above
3 would further reduce impacts. The abovementioned federal, State, and County
4 regulations, the NPDES program and permits, as well as other laws, ordinances,
5 General Plan policies, existing mitigation measures from EIR No. 441, and new
6 mitigation measure 4.19E-N1 would be sufficient to ensure that this impact is less
7 than significant.

8 Mitigation:

9 In addition to the below specific mitigation measures from EIR No. 441 that address
10 wastewater treatment issues directly, existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.5E (refer to
11 the discussion for Impact 4.19.C, above) is also applicable to this impact, and would
12 also aid in reducing impacts from wastewater, as well as new Mitigation Measure
13 4.19.E-N1, also described below.

14 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.15.4A states, "Conventional septic tanks/subsurface
15 disposal systems shall be prohibited within any designated Zone A of an EPA wellhead
16 protection area. Where a difference between Riverside County and EPA septic tank
17 setback distance requirements exists, the EPA standard shall apply."

18 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.5A states, "The development of septic systems shall
19 be in accordance with applicable standards established by Riverside County and other
20 responsible authorities."

21 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.10.9A states, The County, where required, and in
22 accordance with issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
23 (NPDES) permit, shall require the construction and/or grading contractor for
24 individual developments to establish and implement specific Best Management
25 Practices (BMPs) at the time of project implementation."

26 New Mitigation Measure 4.19.E-N1 states, "Conventional septic tanks/subsurface
27 disposal systems shall be prohibited within any designated Zone A of an EPA wellhead
28

1 protection area. Where a difference between Riverside County and EPA septic tank
2 setback distance requirements exists, the more restrictive standard shall apply.”

3 Compliance with County, State, and federal regulations, as well as existing and
4 proposed General Plan policies and Mitigation Measures would ensure that future
5 development accommodated by GPA No. 960 would have a less than significant
6 impact in regards to exceeding wastewater treatment requirements.

7 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.19-313 through 4.19-317

8 4. Impacts: (Impact 4.19.F) Exceed Wastewater Treatment Capacity

9 Future development facilitated by the project would generate increased population
10 and housing, as well as commercial and industrial land uses. Future development
11 accommodated by the land use and policy changes proposed by the Project has the
12 potential to contribute to increased generation of wastewater needing treatment, the
13 provision of which could exceed the existing capacity of the treatment facility. In
14 addition, where sanitary sewer connection and treatment are not available, septic
15 systems would be necessary. The proliferation of septic systems in rural communities
16 may potentially contaminate groundwater with nitrates, ammonia, salts, metals,
17 organic solvents, grease and oil, and other substances, impairing the beneficial uses of
18 local water supplies. Future development accommodated by GPA No. 960 would be
19 required to demonstrate compliance with NPDES permit requirements, the Clean
20 Water Act, the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1970, and CCR
21 Title 22 (Recycled Water), and would thus aid in ensuring the Project would not
22 contribute to increased generation of wastewater needing treatment. Future
23 development would also be subject to several Riverside County regulations, including
24 Ordinance No. 458 (Regulating Flood Hazard Areas and Implementing the National
25 Flood Insurance Program), Ordinance No. 592 (Regulating Sewer Use, Sewer
26 Construction and Industrial Wastewater Discharges in County Service Areas),
27 Ordinance No. 650 (sewer discharge in unincorporated County), Ordinance No. 754
28 (Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls), Ordinance No. 843

(Regulating the Discharge of Wastes into the Public Sewer System for the Highgrove Community), Ordinance No. 856 (Establishing a Septic Tank Prohibition for Specified Areas of Quail Valley and Requiring the Connection of Existing Septic Systems to Sewer), and Ordinance No. 871 (Prohibiting the Installation of Specified Septic Tank Systems in Cherry Valley). Further, development would be required to demonstrate compliance with Policies OS 3.1 through 3.3 (see above), as well as Policies LU 5.3, 21.2, 28.3, 29.7, 30.7, 31.4 and 32.6, which address project consistency with urban water management plans and require projects be reviewed to ensure water resources are adequate for the proposed level of development. Further, applicable mitigation (as discussed under impact 4.19.C and 4.19.C above) would reduce impacts further. New Policy LU 22.2 would ensure water resources are adequate for the proposed level of development. Compliance with the abovementioned federal, State and County regulatory programs, existing laws, ordinances, General Plan policies and mitigation measures would be sufficient to ensure that impacts associated with wastewater treatment capacities are less than significant.

Mitigation:

Existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.5D (listed under Impact 4.19.D, above), 4.15.4A and 4.10.9A (Impact 4.19.E, above), 4.9.1C (Impact 4.19.H, below) and 4.17.5E (Impact 4.19.C, above) would also aid in reducing impacts associated with wastewater treatment facilities to less than significant.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.19-318 through 4.19-322

5. Impacts: (Impact 4.19.G) Result in Significant Adverse Effects Due to the Construction of New or Expanded Water or Wastewater Facilities

Future development accommodated by the land use and policy changes proposed by the Project would result in increased demand for water supply, wastewater treatment and infrastructure to supply these services. These increases would contribute incrementally to the need for new or expanded water and wastewater treatment facilities. Since the Project would be implemented on a case-by-case basis across

1 many individual sites spread across Riverside County over roughly 50 years, however,
2 it would not result in significant impacts tied to specific, inalterable areas. Rather, the
3 future locations of such facilities can be established (located) so as to minimize
4 potential environmental effects. Further, compliance with federal and State
5 regulations, including the Clean Water Act, the California Porter-Cologne Water
6 Quality Control Act of 1970, CCR Title 22 (Recycled Water), and the Water
7 Conservation Act (SBX 7-7) would aid in reducing impacts due to the construction of
8 new or expanded water or wastewater facilities. Several Riverside County regulations
9 would also aid in reducing impacts, including Ordinance No. 592 (regulating sewer
10 use, sewer construction and industrial wastewater discharges in County Service
11 Areas), Ordinance No. 650 (sewer discharge in unincorporated territory), Ordinance
12 No. 692 (construction, reconstruction, abandonment and destruction of wells), and
13 Ordinance No. 843 (regulating the discharge of wastes into the public sewer system
14 for the Highgrove Community). Further, several water resources-related General Plan
15 policies would aid in reducing impacts related to the construction or expansion of
16 water or wastewater treatment facilities. Refer to page 4.19-324, for a full discussion
17 of these policies. Further, applicable mitigation measures would reduce impacts
18 through restricting the use of potable water for non-potable uses, and requiring
19 compliance with all federal, state and local regulations. As such, the abovementioned
20 existing federal, State and County regulatory programs, laws, ordinances, General
21 Plan policies, mitigation measures, and new mitigation measures would be sufficient
22 to ensure that this impact is less than significant.

23 Mitigation:

24 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.1C and 4.17.1D, described below, and Mitigation
25 Measure 4.17.5A, described under Impact 4.19.E, would also aid in reducing impacts
26 associated with the need for new or expanded water and wastewater facilities to less
27 than significant.
28

1 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.1C states, "Development within unincorporated
2 areas of the County shall not use water of any source of quality suitable for potable
3 domestic use for non-potable uses, including cemeteries, golf courses, parks, highway
4 landscaped areas, industrial and irrigation uses, or other non-domestic use if suitable
5 recycled water is available as provided in Sections 13550-13566 of the [California]
6 Water Code and/or Sections 65591-65600 and 65601-65607 of the Public Resource
7 Code. Prior to the issuance of any land use permit, the County shall determine to
8 what extent and in which manner the use of recycled water is required for individual
9 water projects. Future development shall be designed, constructed and maintained in
10 accordance with the recycled water measures mandated by the County."

11 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.1D states, "Riverside County shall enforce
12 compliance with federal, state and local standards for water conservation within
13 residential, commercial or industrial projects. Prior to approval of any development
14 within the County, the project applicant shall submit evidence to Riverside County
15 that all applicable water conservation measures have been met."

16 Compliance with the above-listed Mitigation Measures, in addition to existing
17 regulations, existing and proposed General Plan policies will ensure that GPA No. 960
18 would have a less than significant impact on the environment due to the need for new
19 or expanded water or wastewater facilities.

20 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.19-322 through 4.19-325

21 6. Impacts: (Impact 4.19.H) Substantially Alter Existing Drainage Patterns Resulting in
22 Substantial Erosion or Siltation

23 Future development accommodated by the land use and policy changes proposed by
24 the Project has the potential to increase water erosion, sedimentation and siltation of
25 surface water. This includes short-term construction impacts, as well as long-term
26 operational impacts. Future development also has the potential to threaten, damage
27 or change hydrologic baseline conditions throughout Riverside County over time.
28 However, the adverse effects associated with potential changes to drainage patterns

1 and hydrology, would be avoided, reduced or minimized through adherence to and
2 compliance with federal and State regulations, including the Clean Water Act and the
3 California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1970. Future development
4 would also be required to comply with several County ordinances which serve to
5 reduce impacts related to existing drainage patterns, erosion, or siltation, including
6 Ordinance No. 457 (building codes and fees), Ordinance No. 458 (regulating flood
7 hazard areas and implementing the National Flood Insurance Program), Ordinance
8 No. 461 (road improvement standards), Ordinance No. 659 (Development Mitigation
9 Fee for Residential Development (DIF Program)), Ordinance No. 754
10 (stormwater/urban runoff management and discharge controls), and Ordinance 859
11 (water-efficient landscape requirements). Additionally, several existing and proposed
12 General Plan Open Space policies would further reduce impacts to drainage patterns,
13 erosion and siltation. Refer to page 4.19-328 for a full discussion of these policies.
14 Further, applicable mitigation will further reduce impacts through requiring the
15 preparation of a hydrologic study for any project that may impact hydrologic
16 conditions, requiring proof of implementation of the measures developed in the
17 hydrologic study, requiring incorporation of bioengineering for all projects impact
18 hydrologic conditions, allowing open space uses to accommodate flooding, and
19 requiring the incorporation of a number of grading practices and drainage design
20 features. As such, compliance with federal, State, and County regulations, existing
21 laws, General Plan policies and the existing EIR No. 441 mitigation measures detailed
22 below, would be sufficient to ensure that this impact is less than significant.

23 Mitigation:

24 In addition to the below specific mitigation measures from EIR No. 441 that address
25 drainage patterns and erosion directly, existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.5B and
26 4.17.5D (see Impact 4.19.D, above), 4.17.5E (Impact 4.19.I, below) and 4.9.1D (Impact
27 4.19.J, below), would also aid in reducing impacts on existing drainage patterns,
28 erosion and siltation.

1 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.4A states, "Where development may interfere with,
2 disrupt, or otherwise affect surface or subsurface hydrologic baseline conditions (as
3 determined by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District,
4 the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the California Department of Fish and
5 Wildlife, and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board), preparation of a project-
6 specific hydrologic study shall be required. The hydrologic study shall include (but
7 shall not be limited to): an inventory of surface and subsurface hydrologic conditions
8 existing at the time of the study; an analysis of how the proposed development would
9 affect these hydrologic baseline conditions; and specific measures to limit or eliminate
10 the interference or disruption of the onsite hydrologic process. The hydrologic study
11 shall evaluate the feasibility of incorporating bioengineering measures into any
12 project that may alter the hydrologic process. Where required by the County, the
13 hydrologic study shall include analysis of, at an equal level of detail, potential impacts
14 to tributary or downstream areas. The hydrologic study shall be submitted to the
15 County or responsible entity for review and shall be approved prior to the issuance of
16 any entitlement that would result in the physical modification of the project site."

17 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.4B states, "The project applicant shall submit to the
18 County for review and approval, evidence that the specific measures to limit or
19 eliminate the disruption or interference to the hydrologic process resulting from the
20 entire development process, will be implemented as set forth in the hydrologic study.
21 Such evidence may take the form of (but shall not be limited to): a development
22 agreement; land banking; the provision of adequate funds to guarantee the
23 construction, maintenance or restoration of hydrologic features; or any other
24 mechanism that will achieve said goals. Said evidence shall be submitted and
25 approved prior to the issuance of any entitlement that would result in the physical
26 modification of the project site."

27 ///

28 ///

1 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.4C states, "Bioengineering measures shall be
2 incorporated into any project that may alter the hydrologic process, where
3 determined feasible by the County or responsible entity."

4 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.9.1C states, "The County shall not necessarily require all
5 land uses to withstand flooding. These may include land uses such as agricultural, golf
6 courses, and trails. For these land uses, flows shall not be obstructed, and upstream
7 and downstream properties shall not be adversely affected by increased velocities,
8 erosion backwater effects, concentration of flows, and adverse impacts to water
9 quality from point and nonpoint sources of pollution."

10 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.9.2C states, "Riverside County shall require that for
11 agricultural, recreation or other low-density uses, flows are not obstructed and that
12 upstream and downstream properties are not adversely affected by increased
13 velocities, erosion backwater effects or concentration of flows."

14 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.10.9A states, "Riverside County, where required, and in
15 accordance with issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
16 (NPDES) permit, shall require the construction and/or grading contractor for
17 individual developments to establish and implement specific Best Management
18 Practices (BMPs) at time of project implementation."

19 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.10.9B states, "Prior to any development within the
20 County, a grading plan shall be submitted to the Riverside County Building and Safety
21 Department and/or Riverside County Geologist for review and approval. As required
22 by the County, the grading plan shall include erosion and sediment control plans.
23 Measures included in individual erosion control plans may include, but shall not be
24 limited to, the following:

- 25 • Grading and development plans shall be designed in a manner which
26 minimizes the amount of terrain modification.
- 27 • Surface water shall be controlled and diverted around potential landslide
28 areas to prevent erosion and saturation of slopes.

- Structures shall not be sited on or below identified landslides unless slides are stabilized.
- The extent and duration of ground disturbing activities during and immediately following periods of rain shall be limited, to avoid the potential for erosion which may be accelerated by rainfall on exposed soils.
- To the extent possible, the amount of cut and fill shall be balanced.
- The amount of water entering and exiting a graded site shall be limited through placement of interceptor trenches or other erosion control devices.
- Erosion and sediment control plans shall be submitted to the County [of Riverside] for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits."

Existing Mitigation Measure 4.10.9C states, "Drainage design measures shall be incorporated into the final design of individual projects onsite, where required. These measures shall include, but will not be limited to:

- Runoff entering developing areas shall be collected into surface and subsurface drains for removal to nearby drainages.
- Runoff generated above steep slopes or poorly vegetated areas shall be captured and conveyed to nearby drainages.
- Runoff generated on paved or covered areas shall be conveyed via swales and drains to natural drainage courses.
- Disturbed areas that have been identified as highly erosive shall be (re)vegetated.
- Irrigation systems shall be designed, installed and maintained in a manner which minimizes runoff.
- The landscape scheme for projects within the project site shall utilize drought-tolerant plants.
- Erosion control devices such as rip-rap, gabions, small check dams, etc., may be utilized in gullies and active stream channels to reduce erosion."

1 With the implementation of federal, State, and County regulations, ordinances,
2 existing and proposed General Plan policies and the existing Mitigation Measures
3 listed above, GPA No. 960 would have a less than significant impact on existing
4 drainage patterns, erosion, and siltation.

5 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.19-325 through 4.19-331

6 7. Impacts: (Impact 4.19.I) Cause Runoff Exceeding Stormwater Drainage System Capacity or
7 Cause Substantial Water Pollution

8 Future development accommodated by the land use and policy changes proposed by
9 the Project would result in the development of vacant lands within Riverside County,
10 thereby limiting the amount of ground infiltration during storm events. The addition
11 of impervious surfaces from this development would increase stormwater runoff
12 throughout Riverside County. In some areas, existing drainage facilities may not be
13 adequate to accommodate the increase. However, compliance with State and federal
14 regulations, including the Clean Water Act, CWA Section 402 (National Pollutant
15 Discharge Elimination System), and the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality
16 Control Act of 1970 would aid to reduce impacts due to stormwater flows, runoff and
17 pollution associated with them. Compliance with several Riverside County regulations
18 would also aid in reducing impacts related to causing impacts due to stormwater
19 flows, runoff and associated pollution. Refer to page 4.19-333, for a discussion of the
20 relevant regulations that would aid in decreasing Project impacts. Further, several
21 existing and proposed General Plan Open Space and Land Use policies would address
22 potential impacts to runoff and associated pollution. Refer to page 4.19-34 for a full
23 discussion of these policies. Further, applicable mitigation requires the consideration
24 and incorporation of a number of BMP's as well as containment of 10-year flood flows
25 within the height of the curb in order to further reduce impacts. As such, compliance
26 with the abovementioned federal, State and County regulatory programs, existing
27 laws, ordinances, and General Plan policies listed on pages 4.19-332 through 4.19-336
28 of Section 4.19, "Water Resources" of EIR No. 521, and existing mitigation measures

1 from EIR No. 441, described below, would be sufficient to ensure that this impact is
2 less than significant.

3 Mitigation:

4 In addition to the below specific mitigation measures from EIR No. 441 that address
5 runoff issues directly, existing Mitigation Measures 4.9.2C, 4.10.9A, 4.10.9B and
6 4.10.9C (see Impact 4.19.H, above) and Mitigation Measure 4.17.5B (see Impact
7 4.19.D, above), would also aid in reducing impacts due to runoff.

8 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.5E states, "For each new development project, the
9 following principles and policies shall be considered and implemented:

- 10 a. Avoid or limit disturbance to natural water bodies and drainage systems (including
11 ephemeral drainage systems) when feasible. Provide adequate buffers of native
12 vegetation along drainage systems to lessen erosion and protect water quality.
- 13 b. Appropriate best management practices (BMPs) must be implemented to lessen
14 impacts to waters of the United States and/or waters of the State of California
15 resulting from development. Drainages should be left in a natural condition or
16 modified in a way that preserves all existing water quality standards where
17 feasible. Any discharges of sediment or other wastes, including wastewater, to
18 Waters of the United States or Waters of the State must be avoided to the
19 maximum extent practicable. All such discharges will require an NPDES permit
20 issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).
- 21 c. Small drainages shall be preserved and incorporated into new development, along
22 with adequate buffer zones of native vegetation, to the maximum extent
23 practicable.
- 24 d. Any impacts to waters of the United States require a Section 401 Water Quality
25 Standards Certification from the RWQCB. Impacts to these waters shall be avoided
26 to the maximum extent practicable. Where avoidance is not practicable, impacts
27 to these waters shall be minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Mitigation
28 of unavoidable impacts must, at a minimum, replace the full function and value of

1 the affected water body. Impacts to waters of the United States also require a
2 Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit from the United States Army Corps of
3 Engineers and a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department
4 of Fish and Wildlife.

5 e. The County shall encourage the use of pervious materials in development to
6 retain absorption and allow more percolation of stormwater into the ground. The
7 use of pervious materials, such as grass, permeable/porous pavement, etc., for
8 runoff channels and parking areas shall also be encouraged. Lining runoff channels
9 with impermeable surfaces, such as concrete or grouted riprap, will be
10 discouraged.

11 f. The County shall encourage construction of detention basins or holding ponds
12 and/or constructed wetlands within a project site to capture and treat dry
13 weather urban runoff and the first flush of rainfall runoff. These basins should be
14 designed to detain runoff for a minimum time, such as 24 hours, to allow particles
15 and associated pollutants to settle and to provide for natural treatment.

16 g. The County shall encourage development to retain areas of open space as natural
17 or landscaped to aid in the recharge and retention of runoff. Native plant
18 materials shall be used in replanting and hydroseeding operations, where feasible.

19 h. The County shall require that environmental documents for proposed projects in
20 areas tributary to Canyon Lake Reservoir, Lake Elsinore, sections of the Santa Ana
21 River, Fulmar Lake, and Mill Creek (as a result of the proposed 2002 303 (d) listing
22 of these waterbodies) include discharge prohibitions, revisions to discharge
23 permits, or management plans to address water quality impacts in accordance
24 with the controls that may be applied pursuant to state and federal regulation.
25 Environmental documents shall acknowledge that additional requirements may be
26 imposed in the future for projects in areas tributary to the water bodies listed
27 above.
28

- 1 i. The County shall ensure that in new development, post-development stormwater
2 runoff flow rates do not differ from the pre-development stormwater runoff flow
3 rates.
- 4 j. All construction projects should be designed and implemented to protect, and if at
5 all possible, to improve the quality of the underlying groundwater.
- 6 k. The County shall encourage the enhancement of groundwater recharge wherever
7 possible. Measures such as keeping stream/river channels and floodplains in
8 natural conditions or with pervious surfaces, as well as keeping areas of high
9 recharge as open space will be considered.
- 10 l. The County shall prohibit the discharge of waste material resulting from any type
11 of construction into any drainage areas, channels, streambeds, streams, lakes,
12 wetlands or rivers. Spoil sites shall be prohibited within any streams or areas
13 where spoil material could be washed into a water body.
- 14 m. The County shall require that appropriate BMPs be developed and implemented
15 during construction efforts to control the discharge of pollutants, prevent sewage
16 spills, and to avoid discharge of sediments into the streets, stormwater
17 conveyance channels or waterways."

18 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.9.1.D states, "The County shall require the 10-year
19 flood flows to be contained within the top of curbs and the 100-year flood flows
20 within the street rights-of-way."

21 Implementation of the existing Mitigation Measures, as well as compliance with
22 existing federal, State and County regulations, ordinances, and General Plan policies,
23 would ensure that GPA No. 960 would have a less than significant impact on the
24 capacity of storm drain systems due to the generation of runoff and would not cause
25 a substantial additional source of runoff.

26 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.19-331 to 4.19-337

27 ///

28 ///

1 8. Impacts: (Impact 4.19.J) Cause Significant Adverse Effects Due to the Need for New or
2 Expanded Stormwater Drainage Facilities

3 Future development accommodated by the land use and policy changes proposed by
4 the Project would result in the development of vacant lands within Riverside County.
5 The addition of impervious surfaces would increase the potential stormwater runoff
6 from areas throughout Riverside County. Existing drainage facilities may not be
7 adequate to accommodate the future potential increase in stormwater runoff. As a
8 result, additional storm drain capacity and facilities may be necessary. It is feasible,
9 however, for such future facilities to be planned, sited and constructed in a manner
10 that minimizes potential environmental effects. Future development accommodated
11 by GPA No. 960 would be required to demonstrate compliance with federal and State
12 regulations, including the Clean Water Act and the California Porter-Cologne Water
13 Quality Control Act of 1970. Several Riverside County regulations would also aid in
14 preventing or reducing significant impacts due to the need for new or expanded
15 storm drain facilities (refer to page 4.19-338). In addition, compliance with Policies
16 OS 6.1, 6.3; LU 9.2 and 9.3 would ensure protection of wetlands and other riparian
17 resources from hydrological disruption, protect water quality within floodplains and
18 drainages, and minimize erosion effects. Policies OS 2.1 and 18.1 through 18.6
19 address water conservation through requirements for water-efficient landscaping.
20 Policies OS 3.4 through 3.7 address requirements to comply with NPDES and other
21 regulations addressing pollution discharges and runoff to protect stormwater quality
22 and, ultimately surface and groundwater fed by stormwater runoff. Further,
23 applicable mitigation, as discussed in Impact 4.19.D, 4.19.I and 4.19.H above, will
24 reduce impacts further. The abovementioned existing federal, State and County
25 regulations, laws, ordinances, General Plan policies and mitigation measures
26 described below, would be sufficient to ensure that this impact is less than significant.

27 ///

28 ///

1 Mitigation:

2 Mitigation Measures 4.17.5D (see Impact 4.19.D, above), 4.17.5E (Impact 4.19.I,
3 above) and 4.10.9A, 4.10.9B, 4.10.9C, 4.17.4A, 4.17.4B and 4.17.4C (Impact 4.19.H,
4 above) would also aid in reducing impacts due to the need for new or expanded storm
5 drain facilities.

6 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.9.1.D states, "The County shall require the 10-year
7 flood flows to be contained within the top of curbs and the 100-year flood flows
8 within the street rights-of-way."

9 The implementation of the above-listed Mitigation Measures, in addition to Project
10 compliance with existing regulations, ordinances, and existing and proposed General
11 Plan policies would ensure that GPA No. 960 would have a less than significant impact
12 due to the need for new or expanded stormwater facilities as a result of future
13 development.

14 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.19-337 through 4.19-340

15 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental impacts
16 associated with the Riverside County General Plan Update cannot be fully mitigated and will be only
17 partially avoided or lessened in consideration of existing regulations or mitigation measures hereinafter
18 specified in **Attachment A (Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program)**. Accordingly, and as further
19 explained below, the County makes the following findings as to each of the following impacts as allowed
20 by State CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a): "Changes or alterations [that might further reduce Project
21 impacts] are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the [County].
22 Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other
23 agency"; or "Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision
24 of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or
25 project alternatives identified in the final EIR." Therefore, a statement of overriding considerations
26 consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, 15126(b), and 15126.2(b) and discussed in the Final EIR
27 Section 2.1 is required and included herein.

1 A. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

2 1. Impacts: (Impact 4.5.A) Cause the Conversion of Designated Farmlands

3 The specific land use and policy changes proposed by the Project would adversely
4 affect (i.e., result in the conversion of) only minimal amounts of State-designated
5 Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance and Farmland of Local
6 Importance ("Farmlands") to a variety of non-agricultural uses. No Unique Farmland
7 would be affected. Due to the very small areas involved, these impacts would be less
8 than significant. Indirectly, the growth accommodated and facilitated by the Project
9 would result in additional development and infrastructure demand that would further
10 conversion of designated Farmlands to urban uses and result in other changes in the
11 existing environment leading to additional Farmland conversion. This indirect impact
12 would be significant and unavoidable. The adverse impacts associated with potential
13 changes to agricultural resources would be reduced through the implementation of
14 Riverside County regulations, including Ordinance No. 509 (establishing agricultural
15 preserves) and Ordinance No. 625 (Right to Farm). There are also several existing
16 General Plan Open Space and Land Use policies that help reduce the interface effects
17 of development encroachment from surrounding areas on farmland (refer to page
18 4.5-30). EIR No. 521 determined that no mitigation measures are applicable to offset
19 this impact, however a number of policies and ordinances exist to reduce impacts in
20 this regard. However, the abovementioned applicable Riverside County regulations
21 and policies would not reduce the significant impacts associated with the conversion
22 of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses. Refer to the responses to Letter 3,
23 *Department of Conservation*, and Letter 33, *San Geronio Chapter of the Sierra Club*
24 *(Via Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger)*, of Final EIR No. 521 for further discussion regarding
25 existing County Policies and Ordinances related to agricultural lands and operations.

26 Mitigation:

27 Assuming that 100% of the lands with LUDs being revised are built out with their new
28 designated use, the specific land use and policy changes proposed by the Project

1 would adversely affect (i.e., result in the conversion of) only minimal amounts (32
2 acres) of State-designated Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. In
3 addition, while 210 acres of Farmland of Local Importance would be converted to a
4 variety of non-agricultural uses, nearly 220 acres of lands, including existing fish farms
5 (aquaculture) are proposed for new designation as agriculture ("AG" LUD). As mapped
6 according to the baseline data provided by the State of California, the unincorporated
7 portion of Riverside County has designated Farmland totals of 105,390 acres of Prime,
8 36,660 acres of Statewide Importance, 32,360 acres of Unique and 162,410 acres of
9 Farmland of Local Importance. According to the Riverside County Agricultural
10 Commissioner, the amount of land in agricultural production totaled 187,800 acres as
11 of 2009 (inclusive of cities). Thus, in light of these totals, the loss of 32 acres
12 represents an insignificant amount overall. However, the total amount of land
13 designated for agricultural uses under both the existing General Plan and the General
14 Plan as amended GPA No. 960 at full buildout (roughly 190,000 acres) is *less* than the
15 amount of agricultural land currently designated as Prime, Unique, Statewide and
16 Locally Important Farmland (roughly 336,800 acres). Thus, future development
17 accommodated by the Project in locations not foreseeable at this time would still
18 likely result in the loss of additional Prime, Unique, Statewide and Locally Important
19 Farmlands.

20 Indirectly, the growth accommodated and facilitated by the Project would also result
21 in additional development and infrastructure demand that would further fuel
22 conversion of agricultural uses to urban resulting in further loss of designated
23 Farmlands. Compliance with existing and proposed regulations and General Plan
24 policies would help reduce this indirect impact, however, it would still be significant
25 and unavoidable. For the reasons cited above and according to the Mitigation
26 Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) in Final EIR No. 441 (Table 4A,
27 *"Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Proposed Riverside County General Plan"*),
28

1 "There is no reasonable or feasible mitigation to reduce impacts resulting from the
2 loss of agricultural land to a less than significant level."

3 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.5-29 through 4.5-31

4 2. Impacts: (Impact 4.5.B) *Encroach On or Conflict With Existing Agricultural Uses*

5 Future development pursuant to the land use and policy changes proposed by the
6 Project has the potential to result in conflicts with existing zoning, agricultural uses,
7 and lands subject to a Williamson Act contract or within a Riverside County
8 Agricultural Preserve. It may also result in the introduction of new urban uses within
9 300 feet of agriculturally-zoned property. Indirectly, the growth accommodated and
10 facilitated by the Project would result in additional development and infrastructure
11 demand that would further conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses, encroach
12 on existing agricultural activities and mapped Farmlands, and result in other changes
13 in the existing environment leading to additional Farmland conversion. This indirect
14 impact would be significant and unavoidable. EIR No. 521 determined that no
15 mitigation measures are applicable to offset this impact, however a number of
16 policies and ordinances exist to reduce impacts in this regard. The adverse effects
17 associated with potential changes to agricultural resources would be avoided,
18 reduced or minimized through adherence with Riverside County Ordinance No. 509
19 (establishing agricultural preserves), Ordinance No. 625 (Right to Farm), as well as
20 through compliance with Riverside County rules and regulations governing
21 agricultural preserves. Further, there are several existing and new policies from the
22 Riverside County General Plan that would contribute to lessening development
23 impacts on farmland (refer to page 4.5-34). However, the abovementioned applicable
24 Riverside County regulations and policies would not fully reduce the significant
25 impacts associated with development impacts on agricultural activities, including
26 when applied with mitigation, and as such, a significant and unavoidable impact is
27 identified. Refer to the responses to Letter 3, *Department of Conservation*, and Letter
28 33, *San Geronio Chapter of the Sierra Club (Via Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger)*, of Final

1 EIR No. 521 for further discussion regarding existing County Policies and Ordinances
2 related to agricultural lands and operations.

3 Mitigation:

4 EIR No. 441, prepared for the 2003 RCIP General Plan, found under "Impact 4.2.2"
5 (Final EIR, page 4.2-32) that implementation of the General Plan would "result in the
6 significant conversion of active agricultural land and agricultural soils to non-
7 agricultural uses." Although the existing General Plan includes policies intended to
8 identify and implement programs that would limit the conversion of agricultural land
9 to non-agricultural uses, EIR No. 441 finds that these policies do not set specific
10 requirements that would limit the conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural
11 uses. Further, EIR No. 441 finds the policies do not identify the amount, extent or
12 location of agricultural land to be conserved and that it is impossible to assess if
13 policies would effectively reduce potentially significant impacts associated with the
14 conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses.

15 As discussed in EIR No. 521 under Impact 4.5.B (page 4.5-32), in addition to the 5,340
16 acres that would potentially be directly lost by foreseeable spatial changes associated
17 with the Project, other development resulting from the Project not foreseeable at this
18 time would also be expected to adversely affect existing agricultural uses. As a result,
19 future development accommodated by the land use and policy changes proposed by
20 the project is similarly found to have the potential for significant and unavoidable
21 indirect impacts to agricultural uses through introducing new urban uses within 300
22 feet of agriculturally zoned property and contributing to the demand for additional
23 development and infrastructure that would further fuel conversion of agricultural
24 lands to nonagricultural uses. Pursuant to EIR No. 441, no additional Project-specific
25 mitigation measures are feasible. Thus, impacts due to conflict with existing
26 agricultural zoning or uses, including those leading to the conversion of designated
27 Farmlands, as well as encroachment impacts, would be significant and unavoidable.

28 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.5-32 through 4.5-35

1 B. Air Quality

2 1. Impacts: (Impact 4.6.A) Cause Inconsistency With Air Quality Plans

3 Future development associated with the Project represents a reduction in Riverside
4 County capacity and yields lower population growth forecasts, both compared to the
5 existing General Plan and to current SCAG (2008 RTP) projections. Since air quality
6 management plans (AQMPs) are developed using growth forecasts issued by the
7 applicable regional association of governments (SCAG, etc.), a project that is
8 consistent with the applicable growth forecast would generally be consistent with the
9 AQMP. This is the case for the Project. Further, it includes a number of new policies
10 and programs related to greenhouse gas reductions that would also improve air
11 quality for a variety of criteria pollutants addressed in AQMPs. Compliance with
12 existing regulatory programs, Riverside County ordinances and General Plan policies,
13 as well as new ones included in the Project (GPA No. 960), would further reduce this
14 impact by reducing conflicts with or obstruction of the AQMP. However, while the
15 existing General Plan policies and new ones included in GPA No. 960 may reduce
16 conflicts and obstruction of any AQMP, the combined emissions from all proposed
17 General Plan development would exceed the SCAQMD and MDAQMD significance
18 thresholds for criteria pollutants. Exceeding these thresholds has the potential to
19 hinder the region's compliance with each AQMP. Therefore, this impact is significant
20 and unavoidable. However, Riverside County Ordinance No. 706 and Ordinance No.
21 726 would help to reduce motor vehicle emissions of criteria pollutants through
22 reduction of vehicle miles traveled (refer to General Plan Section 4.6.3). Further,
23 future projects accommodated by GPA No. 960 would be required to demonstrate
24 consistency with several existing and proposed General Plan Land Use, Circulation,
25 and Air Quality policies that would further ensure any potential environmental effects
26 are avoided, reduced or minimized through their application on a case-by-case basis.
27 Refer to page 4.6-50 for a full discussion regarding these policies and their application.
28 The proposed mitigation would reduce impacts in regards to air quality impacts by

1 requiring development to meet state reduction targets, and requiring compliance
2 with the proposed Climate Action Plan. However, the abovementioned applicable
3 Riverside County regulations and policies would not fully reduce the significant
4 impacts associated with air quality plan compliance, including when applied with the
5 mitigation described below.

6 Mitigation:

7 Additional Project-specific mitigation measures are necessary to further avoid, reduce
8 or minimize impacts from operational pollutant emissions. The following mitigation
9 measures from EIR Section 4.7, "*Greenhouse Gases*" would also reduce air pollution
10 by reducing energy use and vehicle miles traveled and ensure county compliance with
11 applicable air quality management and attainment plans.

12 New Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N1 states, "In order to ensure GHG emissions resulting
13 from new development are reduced to levels necessary to meet California State
14 targets, the County of Riverside shall require all new discretionary development to
15 comply with the Implementation Measures of the Riverside County Climate Action
16 Plan or provide comparable custom measure backed by a project GHG study (for
17 example, using CalEEMod modeling) demonstrating achievement of the same target.
18 The target to be met is a GHG emissions reduction of 25% below emissions for the
19 adjusted "business as usual" (BAU) scenario for residential, commercial, industrial,
20 institutional and mixed-use projects. The adjusted BAU is based upon the 2020 BAU
21 found in the Final Supplement to the AB 32 Scoping Plan (CARB 2011)."

22 New Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N2 states, "In lieu of a project-specific GHG analysis
23 per Mitigation Measures 4.7.A-N1, a future discretionary project pursuant to the
24 Riverside County General Plan shall incorporate into the project design, operational
25 features and/or Implementing Measures from the County Climate Action Plan (CAP),
26 in such a manner as to garnish at least 100 points. The point values within the CAP's
27 Screening Tables constitute GHG emission reductions."
28

1 With implementation of and compliance with the regulatory programs discussed in
2 EIR No. 521, Section 4.6, "Air Quality," Riverside County ordinances, existing and
3 proposed General Plan policies, as well as proposed new Mitigation Measures 4.7.A-
4 N1 and N2, air pollutant emissions from future development accommodated by GPA
5 No. 960 would be reduced but would still exceed regulatory thresholds for the South
6 Coast Air Basin (SCAB), Salton Sea Air Basin (SSAB), and Mojave Desert Air Basin
7 (MDAB). Exceedance of regulatory thresholds would conflict with the implementation
8 of the applicable air quality plans. Implementation of greenhouse gas reduction
9 measures would afford additional reductions in criteria air pollutants; however, it
10 would not reduce criteria pollutant impacts to below regulatory thresholds. Thus,
11 impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project would remain
12 significant and unavoidable with respect to regional air quality plans.

13 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.6-48 through 4.6-52

14 2. Impacts: (Impact 4.6.B(1)) Cause Significant Construction (Short-Term) Air Emissions

15 Future development accommodated by the proposed Project would result in
16 construction activities generating air quality emissions that may be quantified based
17 on the level of daily disturbance. However, since GPA No. 960 would be implemented
18 through many (perhaps thousands) of individual projects occurring throughout
19 Riverside County over next roughly 50 years, the level of daily disturbance for GPA No.
20 960 cannot be calculated and, therefore, the associated construction emissions
21 cannot be quantified. Although implementing projects may be individually consistent
22 with air quality standards, because of the cumulative nature of air emissions, such
23 projects may nonetheless cumulatively exceed an air quality standard. Thus, even
24 with implementation of the regulations, existing policies and mitigation measures
25 outlined herein that reduce emissions, it cannot be guaranteed that they would be
26 cumulatively reduced to below applicable thresholds. Thus, this impact would be
27 significant and unavoidable with respect to violations of air quality standards for
28 construction activities. Future development accommodated by GPA No. 960 would be

1 required to comply with the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, which
2 accommodates growth within the region while introducing enforceable strategies to
3 reduce the high levels of pollutants within areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD.
4 Further, there are several existing and proposed General Plan Air Quality policies that
5 would further contribute to reducing construction-related pollutant emissions,
6 including Policies AQ 1.1-1.4, 1.10, 2.1, 4.8-4.10, 15.1, 16.1, 16.3, 17.1, 17.3, 17.4,
7 17.6, 17.8 and 17.11, which promote the reduction of criteria pollutant emission
8 through the development and enforcement of plans, policies and regulations and
9 fees. Policy AQ 5.1 encourages the use of building methods and use/reuse of
10 materials to reduce the amount of emissions generated during the use or disposal of
11 construction materials. Policy AQ 4.7 promotes the reduction of criteria pollutant
12 emission through the development and enforcement of plans, policies and regulations
13 and fees. Policy AQ 4.1 requires the use of building methods and use/reuse of
14 materials to reduce the amount of emissions generated during the use or disposal of
15 construction materials. Further, applicable mitigation would reduce impacts by
16 imposing a number of site specific operational standards including watering,
17 pavement of access roads, materials hauling protocols, as well as other requirements
18 to reduce air quality impacts. However, the abovementioned applicable Riverside
19 County regulations and policies would not fully reduce the significant impacts
20 associated with construction-related pollutant emissions, including when applied with
21 the mitigation described below.

22 Mitigation:

23 In EIR No. 441, prepared for the 2003 RCIP General Plan, Mitigation Measures 4.5.1A,
24 4.5.1B and 4.5.1C were imposed to reduce impacts to air quality. These measures
25 remain applicable to this Project and would lessen impacts to air quality by minimizing
26 fugitive dust during construction and reducing pollution resulting from construction
27 equipment.
28

1 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.5.1A states, "Applicable SCAQMD Rule 403 Measures:
2 Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to
3 all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).

- 4 • Water active sites at least twice daily. (Locations where grading is to occur will
5 be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving.)
- 6 • All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered, or
7 should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the
8 requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114 (freeboard
9 means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).
- 10 • Pave construction access roads at least 100 feet onto the site from main road.
- 11 • Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less."

12 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.5.1B states, "[Implement the following] additional
13 SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook dust measures to be implemented:

- 14 • Re-vegetate disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- 15 • All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds
16 (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.
- 17 • All streets shall be swept once a day if visible soil materials are carried to
18 adjacent streets (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water).
- 19 • Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved
20 roads, or wash trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip."

21 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.5.1C states, "[Implement the following] mitigation
22 measures to be implemented for construction equipment and vehicles exhaust
23 emissions:

- 24 • The construction contractor shall select the construction equipment used on
25 site based on low emission factors and high energy efficiency.
- 26 • The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans
27 include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and
28 maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.

- The construction contractor shall utilize electric- or diesel-powered equipment, in lieu of gasoline-powered engines, where feasible.
- The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period will be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time.
- The construction contractor shall time the construction activities so as to not interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flagperson shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.
- The construction contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew.
- Dust generated by the development activities shall be retained on-site and kept to a minimum by following the dust control measures listed below.
 - During clearing, grading, earthmoving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease.
 - During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the late morning, after work is completed for the day and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour.
 - Immediately after clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated until the

1 area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not
2 occur.

- 3 ○ Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or
4 treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.
- 5 ○ Trucks transporting soil, sand, cut or fill materials and/or construction
6 debris to or from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin."

7 Despite all of the above measures that lessen impacts from construction, additional
8 Project-specific mitigation measures would be necessary to ensure that impacts are
9 less than significant. New Mitigation Measure 4.6.B-N1 would lessen the impact by
10 reducing fugitive emissions of particulate matter. New Mitigation Measures 4.6.B-N2
11 and 4.6.B-N3 would reduce impacts by limiting the amount of emissions generated by
12 internal combustion engines. Implementation of these additional mitigation measures
13 would further reduce Project impacts, although it would not be guaranteed that the
14 impacts would be cumulatively reduced to below threshold levels (even if individual
15 emissions were reduced). Therefore, impacts from construction activities would still
16 be significant and unavoidable.

17 New Mitigation Measure 4.6.B-N1 states, "Construction contractors for future
18 projects shall ensure that all disturbed areas and stock piles are watered at least three
19 times per day or soil stabilizers are applied as necessary to prevent visible dust
20 plumes from these areas. Stock piles not in use may be covered with a tarp to
21 eliminate the need for watering or other stabilizers."

22 New Mitigation Measure 4.6.B-N2 states, "All construction equipment used in
23 development of future projects to have EPA rated engines of Tier 3 or better."

24 New Mitigation Measure 4.6.B-N3 states, "As soon as electric utilities are available at
25 construction sites of future projects, the construction sites shall be supplied with
26 electricity from the local utility and all equipment that can be electrically operated
27 shall use the electric utility rather than portable generators."
28

1 In addition to site-specific mitigation that would be determined on a project-by-
2 project basis, existing Riverside County practices, SCAQMD and MDAQMD rules,
3 would reduce construction-related impacts by reducing air pollutant emissions from
4 construction activities. However, even where such measures would reduce an
5 individual project's emissions to less than significant levels, none of the measures
6 herein serve to prevent individual actions from being constructed concurrently, and
7 thus, resulting in cumulatively significant impacts. Additionally, neither the amount of
8 construction occurring nor the exact location within the County is foreseeable; thus, it
9 cannot be determined if the resultant construction emissions could be adequately
10 controlled or reduced to below regulatory thresholds. Without such information, it is
11 not possible to conclude that air pollutant emissions resulting from construction
12 activities would be adequately reduced and, therefore, this impact must be assumed
13 to remain significant and unavoidable.

14 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.6-52 through 4.6-57

15 3. Impacts: (Impact 4.6.B(2)) Cause Significant Operational (Long-Term) Air Emissions

16 Stationary and mobile sources would emit criteria pollutants based on the level of
17 daily operation. Modeling results indicate that such emissions would be large, both
18 for individual future projects and cumulatively due to the countywide scale of GPA
19 No. 960. Even with the implementation of regulations, ordinances and existing and
20 proposed General Plan policies, in addition to new mitigation measures, criteria
21 pollutant emissions would not be reduced below regulatory thresholds. Thus, this
22 impact would remain significant and unavoidable with respect to violations of air
23 quality standards for operational activities.

24 Mitigation:

25 In addition to the new Mitigation Measures listed below, project-specific Mitigation
26 Measures, found in EIR No. 521, Section 4.7, "Greenhouse Gases" will also reduce air
27 pollutants and further avoid, reduce or minimize impacts from operational pollutant
28 emissions. Specifically, Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N1 would lessen the impact by

1 requiring new development projects to reduce their individual project emissions
2 through required state air quality standards by compliance with the Climate Action
3 Plan in order to reduce emissions, or through measures developed and supported by
4 a GHG study. Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N2 would lessen the impact by allowing
5 projects to demonstrate compliance with the Implementation Measures of the
6 Climate Action Plan (CAP) by utilizing the Screening Tables which require the
7 implementation of a number of measures to meet a minimum compliance standard.
8 New Mitigation Measures 4.6.B-N4 and 4.6.B-N5 would also contribute to the
9 reduction of impacts from operational pollutant emissions by requiring developments
10 to use coatings low in reactive organic gasses, and the use of low emission appliance
11 to reduce operational impacts of new development, as further described below.

12 New Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N1 states, "In order to ensure GHG emissions resulting
13 from new development are reduced to levels necessary to meet State of California
14 targets, the County shall require all new discretionary development to comply with
15 the Implementation Measures of the Riverside County Climate Action Plan or provide
16 comparable custom measures backed by a project GHG study (for example, using
17 CalEEMod modeling) demonstrating achievement of the same target. The target to be
18 met is a GHG emissions reduction of 25% below emissions for the adjusted BAU
19 scenario for residential, commercial, industrial, institutional and mixed-use projects.
20 The adjusted BAU is based upon the 2020 BAU found in the Final Supplement to the
21 AB 32 Scoping Plan (CARB 2011)."

22 New Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N2 states, "In lieu of a project-specific analysis per
23 Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N1, a future discretionary project proposed pursuant to the
24 Riverside County General Plan shall incorporate into the project design, operational
25 features and/or Implementing Measures from the Riverside County Climate Action
26 Plan, in such a manner as to garnish at least 100 points. The point values within the
27 CAP's Screening Tables constitute GHG emission reductions."
28

1 New Mitigation Measure 4.6.B-N4 states, "All new development shall ensure that all
2 interior and exterior architectural coatings used are low in reactive organic gases."

3 New Mitigation Measure 4.6.B-N5 states, "If hearths are included in new residential
4 developments, they shall be energy-efficient natural gas appliances. No wood-burning
5 hearths or stoves shall be permitted in new residential developments."

6 Existing regulations and ordinances would reduce operation-related impacts by
7 reducing air pollutant emissions from stationary and mobile sources. However, even
8 with the implementation of new mitigation measures, the operational emissions
9 under the proposed Project would likely exceed both SCAQMD and MDAQMD
10 thresholds. Therefore, the implementation of proposed GPA No. 960 would result in
11 significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to the emission of criteria pollutants.

12 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.6-57 through 4.6-61

13 4. Impacts: (Impact 4.6.D) *Expose Sensitive Receptors to Air Pollutants*

14 Sensitive population groups include children, the elderly, the acutely and chronically
15 ill, including those with cardio-respiratory diseases. Future development
16 accommodated by the Project would expose sensitive receptors to pollutant
17 emissions from both construction and operational activities. The degree of impact
18 would depend on the type of operation, distance from sensitive receptors and the
19 level of activity at each site. However, as the exact location, timing and level of future
20 development activities arising from GPA No. 960 is unforeseeable, specific impacts to
21 sensitive receptors cannot be quantified. General Plan Policies, as outlined on page
22 4.6-68 of EIR No. 521, would reduce emissions exposure to sensitive receptors by
23 encouraging building operations to use and reuse materials to reduce energy use and
24 waster generation, promoting reductions in mobile source emissions, and reduction
25 of criteria pollutants through use of energy efficiency measures and site design.
26 Further, applicable mitigation would reduce impacts by requiring installation of
27 devices developed to reduce toxic air contaminants and requiring buffering between
28 incompatible uses. Thus, even after complying with federal, State and County

1 regulations, existing General Plan policies and mitigation measures, as well as specific
2 new mitigation measures, impacts cannot be guaranteed to be reduced to below
3 applicable agency thresholds. Thus, this impact would be significant and unavoidable
4 with respect to exposure of sensitive receptors.

5 Mitigation:

6 In EIR No. 441, prepared for the 2003 RCIP General Plan, Mitigation Measures 4.5.1A,
7 4.5.1B and 4.5.1C were imposed to reduce impacts to sensitive receptors. These
8 measures, as listed under Impact 4.6.B(1), above, are also applicable to this impact.
9 They would lessen impacts to air quality by minimizing fugitive dust during
10 construction and reducing pollution resulting from construction equipment.

11 Despite all of the above measures to lessen impacts to air quality, additional Project-
12 specific mitigation measures would be necessary to further avoid, reduce or minimize
13 impacts. For future development accommodated by GPA No. 960 that exceeds
14 regulatory thresholds for construction or operational emissions (even after the
15 inclusion of existing policies and regulations), the following new Mitigation Measures
16 4.6.D-N1 and 4.6.D-N2 shall be implemented. Additionally, implementation of new
17 Mitigation Measures 4.6.B-N1, 4.6.B-N2 and 4.6.B-N3, as listed under impact 4.6.B(1),
18 above, would further reduce construction or operational emissions, which in turn will
19 reduce the concentration of air pollutants sensitive receptors will be exposed to
20 within the County.

21 New Mitigation Measure 4.6.D-N1 states, new developments shall include the
22 following requirements to reduce emissions associated with toxic air contaminants
23 (TACs):

- 24 a. Electrical outlets shall be included in the building design of any loading docks to
25 allow use by refrigerated delivery trucks. Signage shall also be installed, instructing
26 commercial vehicles to limit idling times to five minutes or less. If loading and/or
27 unloading of perishable goods would occur for more than five minutes and
28 continual refrigeration is required, all refrigerated delivery trucks shall use the

1 electrical outlets to continue powering the truck refrigeration units when the
2 delivery truck engine is turned off.

- 3 b. Electrical outlets shall be installed on the exterior of new structures for use with
4 electrical landscaping equipment. Further, the property owner(s) shall ensure that
5 the hired landscape companies use electric-powered equipment where available
6 to a minimum of 20% of the equipment used."

7 New Mitigation Measure 4.6.D-N2 states, "The County shall require minimum
8 distances between potentially incompatible land uses, as described below, unless a
9 project-specific evaluation of human health risks defines, quantifies and reduces the
10 potential incremental health risks through site design or the implementation of
11 additional reduction measures to levels below applicable standards. (e.g., standards
12 recommended or required by CARB, SCAQMD or MDAQMD).

13 **SCAQMD Jurisdiction:**

- 14 a. Proposed dry cleaners and film processing services that use perchloroethylene
15 must be sited at least 500 feet from existing sensitive land uses including
16 residential, schools, day care facilities, congregate care facilities, hospitals or other
17 places of long-term residency for people.
- 18 b. Proposed auto body repair services shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing
19 sensitive land uses.
- 20 c. Proposed gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput of less than 3.6
21 million gallons shall be sited at least 50 feet from existing sensitive land uses.
22 Proposed gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput at or above 3.6
23 million gallons shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing sensitive land uses.
- 24 d. Other proposed sources of TACs including furniture manufacturing and repair
25 services that use methylene chloride or other solvents identified as a TAC shall be
26 sited at least 300 feet from existing sensitive land uses.
- 27 e. Avoid siting distribution centers that accommodate more than 100 truck trips per
28 day (or more than 40 truck trips operating transport refrigeration units per day, or

1 where transportation refrigeration units operate more than 300 hours per week)
2 within 1,000 feet of existing sensitive land uses.

- 3 f. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing
4 freeways, major urban roadways with 100,000 vehicles per day or more and major
5 rural roadways with 50,000 vehicles per day or more.
- 6 g. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing dry
7 cleaners and film processing services that use perchloroethylene.
- 8 h. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing auto
9 body repair services.
- 10 i. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 50 feet from existing gasoline
11 dispensing stations with an annual throughput of less than 3.6 million gallons and
12 300 feet from existing gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput at
13 or above 3.6 million gallons.
- 14 j. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing land uses
15 that use methylene chloride or other solvents identified as a TAC.
- 16 k. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 1,000 feet from existing
17 distribution centers that accommodate more than 100 trucks per day,
18 accommodate more than 40 trucks per day with transportation refrigeration units,
19 or where transportation refrigeration units operate more than 300 hours per
20 week.

21 **MDAQMD Jurisdiction:**

- 22 a. Proposed industrial projects must be sited at least 1,000 feet from existing
23 sensitive land uses.
- 24 b. Proposed distribution centers with 40 or more truck per day shall be sited at least
25 1,000 feet from existing sensitive land uses.
- 26 c. Proposed dry cleaner using perchloroethylene shall be sited at least 500 feet from
27 existing sensitive land uses.
- 28

- 1 d. Proposed gasoline dispensing facility shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing
2 sensitive land uses.
- 3 e. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing
4 freeways, major urban roadways with 100,000 vehicles per day or more and major
5 rural roadways with 50,000 vehicles per day or more.
- 6 f. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 1,000 feet from existing
7 industrial facilities or distribution centers with more than 40 trucks per day.
- 8 g. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing dry
9 cleaners using perchloroethylene.
- 10 h. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing gasoline
11 dispensing stations."

12 The existing Riverside County ordinances, policies and programs to implement and
13 comply with SCAQMD and MDAQMD rules would reduce construction and operation
14 related impacts. However, the Project would result in the future development of
15 numerous projects each contributing incrementally to air emissions affecting sensitive
16 receptors. Thus, it is possible that the Project would result in cumulatively significant
17 impacts to sensitive receptors, even if individual projects were each less than
18 significant. This is particularly likely since none of the measures herein would prevent
19 multiple development projects from being constructed concurrently within close
20 proximity to sensitive receptors in such a manner as to cause substantial
21 concentrations within the area. Further, neither the amount of construction occurring
22 nor the exact location within the County is foreseeable and, as such, it cannot be
23 determined if the resultant construction emissions could be adequately controlled or
24 reduced to below regulatory thresholds. Without such information, it is not possible
25 to conclude that air pollutant emissions resulting from construction activities would
26 be adequately reduced to the point that sensitive receptors are not exposed to
27 substantial concentrations of air pollutants, and thus, a significant and unavoidable
28 impact may result.

Existing regulations and ordinances would reduce operation-related impacts by reducing air pollutant emissions from stationary and mobile sources. Even with the implementation of new Project-specific mitigation measures, cumulative operational emissions resulting from future development would likely exceed both the SCAQMD and MDAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the implementation of GPA No. 960 would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to sensitive receptors.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.6-66 through 4.6-71

C. Greenhouse Gases

1. Impacts: (Impact 4.7.B) Conflict with GHG Reduction Plans, Policies or Regulations

Implementation of the Riverside County General Plan, as updated pursuant to the proposed project (GPA No. 960), would result in future construction and operational activities that generate GHGs. This generation of GHGs would potentially conflict with the implementation of AB 32 and SB 375, California policies for reducing GHG emissions, in addition to Executive Order S-3-05. However, implementation of the proposed General Plan policies, compliance with federal, State, and County regulations (refer to Impact 4.7.A for a full description of these regulations and policies), and particularly the Implementation Measures of the Riverside County CAP, would ensure that buildout of the General Plan, as amended by GPA No. 960, would be consistent with both AB 32 and SB 375 and have a less than significant impact on their implementation. Further, applicable mitigation measures would reduce impacts by requiring compliance with State air quality standards through implementation of the Climate Action Plan in order to reduce emissions, or through measures developed and supported by a GHG study, or using the CAP Screening Tables in order to meet the minimum requirements of the CAP through a variety of proposed measures. However, the achievement of the 2050 reduction target in Executive Order S-3-05 is technologically infeasible at this time and therefore implementation of GPA No. 960 would result in significant and unavoidable impacts.

1 Mitigation:

2 Implementation of, and compliance with, the existing regulatory programs, General
3 Plan policies and Riverside County CAP, as well as new Mitigation Measures 4.7.A-N1
4 and 4.7.A-N2, would ensure that development authorized pursuant to the General
5 Plan, as amended by the proposed project, GPA No. 960, would have less than
6 significant impacts on reducing GHG emissions and achieving the AB32 and SB 375
7 reduction targets. However, implementation of, and compliance with, the existing
8 regulatory programs General Plan policies and Riverside County CAP, as well as new
9 Mitigation Measures 4.7.A-N1 and 4.7.A-N2, will not achieve the 2050 goal in
10 Executive Order S-3-05 and achievement of that goal is technologically infeasible at
11 this time. Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N3 commits the County to develop a post 2020
12 CAP that demonstrates achievement of 2035 and 2050 reduction targets and that the
13 post 2020 CAP is adopted by January 1, 2020. This allows time for the development of
14 new technology needed to achieve the 2050 goal and the County time to provide a
15 post 2020 CAP in sync with the State goals and reductions.

16 Because achievement of the 2050 reduction target in Executive Order S-3-05 is
17 technologically infeasible to achieve at this time, impacts on GHG emissions are
18 considered significant and unavoidable.

19 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.7-54 through 4.7-57

20 D. Noise

21 1. Impacts: (Impact 4.15.A) Generate Noise or Cause Noise Exposure in Excess of Standards

22 Future development accommodated by the Project would incrementally increase
23 rural, suburban and urban uses in localized areas throughout unincorporated
24 Riverside County. In some locations, this would result in the introduction of new
25 noise-sensitive land uses into areas of existing excess noise or areas in which Riverside
26 County growth would eventually lead to excess noise levels. In addition, future
27 development accommodated by GPA No. 960 would contribute incrementally to
28 increased traffic volumes on Riverside County roads, resulting in noise increases

1 affecting sensitive land uses along existing and future roads. As a result, new
2 development, particularly residential uses along and adjacent to major transit
3 corridors, could be exposed to noise levels that exceed Riverside County's noise
4 standards. Existing sensitive uses would also be subject to these higher noise levels.
5 Future development accommodated by GPA No. 960 would be required to conform to
6 several federal, State, and County regulations regarding noise, including the Federal
7 Noise Control Act of 1972, the California Building Standards Code, the California Noise
8 Insulation Standards, and Ordinance No. 847 (regulating noise). Further, there are
9 several existing and proposed General Plan Land Use, Noise, and Open Space policies
10 that would contribute to reducing Project impacts to noise (refer to page 4.15-163).
11 Further, compliance with applicable mitigation would reduce impacts by requiring
12 compliance with indoor and outdoor noise standards, requiring completion of an
13 acoustical study for developments with excessive noise exposure and projects
14 adjacent to sensitive uses, requiring a minimum buffering distance of two miles
15 between schools and airports, as well as requiring buffering between industrial
16 development and other uses. Compliance with existing noise standards, State and
17 County regulatory programs, General Plan policies and mitigation measures would
18 reduce the effects of noise on new development to less than significant levels.
19 However, where noise generators would expose existing receptors (residences and
20 other sensitive uses) to excessive noise, impacts would be significant and
21 unavoidable, as mitigation of these incremental and widespread noise impacts is
22 infeasible.

23 Mitigation:

24 In EIR No. 441, certified for the 2003 RCIP General Plan, Mitigation Measures 4.13.2A,
25 B, C and D (described below) were imposed to reduce impacts associated with long-
26 term noise sources that would exceed Riverside County noise standards. These
27 measures remain applicable to this Project. Mitigation Measure 4.13.2A would lessen
28 noise impacts by restricting development of noise-sensitive uses if exterior and

1 interior noise standards cannot be met. Mitigation Measure 4.13.2B would lessen
2 noise impacts by requiring preparation of a site-specific noise analysis ("describing
3 how the exterior and interior noise standards will be met") for residential projects
4 with a noise exposure greater than 65 dBA Day-Night Average Level (L_{dn}) to ensure
5 that homes are situated in appropriately quiet areas or are constructed with the
6 necessary sound attenuation measures to reduce noise levels to appropriate levels.
7 Mitigation Measure 4.13.2C would lessen impacts by also requiring new commercial
8 and industrial development proposals include a noise study that analyzes site-specific
9 noise impacts and provides mitigation appropriate for achieving the allowable noise
10 levels. Mitigation Measure 4.13.2D would lessen noise impacts on schools by
11 restricting their development within 2 miles of an airport. In addition, EIR No. 441 also
12 included Mitigation Measures 4.13.3A, 4.13.3B and 4.13.3C (described below) to
13 address impacts from stationary noise sources. These measures would also apply to
14 future development accommodated by GPA No. 960.

15 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.13.2A states, "All new residential developments within
16 the County shall conform to a noise exposure standard of 65 dBA L_{dn} for outdoor
17 noise in noise-sensitive outdoor activity areas and 45 dBA L_{dn} for indoor noise in
18 bedrooms and living/family rooms. New development, which does not and cannot be
19 made to conform to this standard, shall not be permitted."

20 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.13.2B states, "Acoustical studies be conducted,
21 describing how the exterior and interior noise standards will be met, for all new
22 residential developments with a noise exposure greater than 65 dBA L_{dn} . The studies
23 shall also satisfy the requirements set forth in Title 24, Part 2 of the California
24 [Building] Code (Noise Insulation Standards), for multiple-family attached homes,
25 hotels, motels, etc. No development permits or approval of land use applications shall
26 be issued until an acoustic analysis is received and approved by the [Riverside] County
27 Planning Department."
28

1 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.13.2C states, "The County shall require that proposed
2 new commercial and industrial developments prepare acoustical studies, analyzing
3 potential noise impacts on adjacent properties, when these developments abut noise-
4 sensitive land uses. The County will require that all direct impacts to noise-sensitive
5 land uses be mitigated to the maximum extent practicable."

6 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.13.2D states, "All new schools, particularly in
7 subdivisions and specific plans, shall be sited more than 2 miles away from any
8 airport."

9 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.13.3A states "Acoustical studies shall be conducted for
10 all new noise-sensitive projects that may be affected by existing noise from stationary
11 sources."

12 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.13.3B states, "To permit new development of
13 residential and noise-sensitive land uses where existing stationary noise sources
14 exceed [Riverside] County's noise standards, effective mitigation measures shall be
15 implemented to reduce noise exposure to or below the allowable levels of the zoning
16 code/noise control ordinance."

17 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.13.3C states, "No industrial facilities shall be
18 constructed within 500 feet of any commercial land uses or within 2,800 feet of any
19 residential uses without the preparation of a noise impact analysis. This analysis shall
20 document the nature of the industrial facility as well as "noise producing" operations
21 associated with that facility. Furthermore, the analysis shall document the placement
22 of any existing or proposed commercial or residential land uses situated within the
23 noted distances. The analysis shall determine the potential noise levels that could be
24 received at these commercial and/or residential land uses and specify measures to be
25 employed by the industrial facility to ensure that these levels do not exceed
26 [Riverside] County noise requirements. Such measures could include, but are not
27 limited to, the use of enclosures for noisy pieces of equipment, the use of noise walls
28 and/or berms for exterior equipment and/or on-site truck operations, and/or

1 restrictions on hours of operations. No development permits or approval of land use
2 applications shall be issued until an acoustic analysis is received and approved by the
3 County [of Riverside] staff."

4 Compliance with the above regulations, standards, policies and existing mitigation
5 measures would ensure potentially adverse impacts related to noise generation and
6 noise exposure associated with future new development accommodated by GPA No.
7 960 would be less than significant. In particular, compliance with Mitigation Measures
8 4.13.2A and 4.13.2B would ensure that new residential uses are only allowed if they
9 would achieve interior noise levels of 45 dBA, consistent with Riverside County
10 standards. Existing sensitive uses, particularly residences, however, would also be
11 subject to project-related traffic noise increases. Much of the mitigation listed above
12 would not be feasible for reducing widespread noise exposures to existing uses,
13 particularly from roadway noise or other noises generated outside of a new
14 development site. For this reason, noise impacts would be significant and
15 unavoidable.

16 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.15-160 through 4.15-165

17 2. Impacts: (Impact 4.15.C) Result in a Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise
18 Levels

19 Future development associated with implementation of the Project would contribute
20 to an increase in traffic, resulting in a corresponding increase in traffic noise. In some
21 cases, this would cause ambient noise levels to either exceed the threshold of
22 acceptability (65 dBA CNEL, for example) or to become further unacceptable in areas
23 already exceeding noise thresholds. Buildout accommodated by GPA No. 960 would
24 be required to conform to the State and federal requirements for noise, including the
25 Federal Noise Control Act of 1972, the California Building Standards Code, California
26 Noise Insulation Standards, Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans,
27 and Ordinance No. 847 (regulating noise). Further, there are several existing and
28 proposed General Plan Noise, Land Use, and Circulation Policies that would aid in

1 reducing impacts associated with increased noise levels (refer to page 4.15-170).
2 Additionally, applicable mitigation measures will further reduce impacts through the
3 methods outlined in Impact 4.15.A above. Compliance with abovementioned existing
4 laws, federal, State and County regulatory programs, General Plan policies and
5 mitigation measures described below, would reduce potential impacts due to
6 increased noise levels. For new development, full mitigation would typically be
7 feasible. For existing noise-sensitive land uses, however, due to the widespread and
8 pervasive nature of the noise impacts, it is generally not feasible to fully mitigate the
9 impact for all affected receptors. Thus, this impact would be significant and
10 unavoidable, even with the implementation of all feasible mitigation.

11 Mitigation:

12 In EIR No. 441, certified for the 2003 RCIP General Plan, Mitigation Measures 4.13.3A,
13 4.13.3B and 4.13.3C (as discussed in the mitigation discussion in Impact 4.15.A, above)
14 were imposed to reduce stationary noise impacts from future development to less
15 than significant. These measures remain applicable to this Project. Mitigation
16 Measure 4.13.3A would lessen noise impacts by requiring the preparation and
17 approval of a site-specific noise study. Mitigation Measure 4.13.3B requires
18 implementation of mitigation measures where development noise levels would
19 expose people to noise levels higher than the identified standard. Mitigation Measure
20 4.13.3C would lessen impacts associated with this issue by restricting certain types of
21 land uses within a certain distance of noise-sensitive uses. In addition, existing EIR No.
22 441 Mitigation Measures 4.13.2A, 4.13.2B, 4.13.2C and 4.13.2D, presented in the
23 mitigation discussion for Impact 4.15.A, shall also apply as mitigation for this impact.
24 Excessive (i.e., exceeding regulatory standards) exterior and interior noise in existing
25 and proposed noise-sensitive areas can be remediated by such mitigation strategies
26 as relocating roadways, applying roadway coatings or reducing road speeds, building
27 sound walls, providing buffer zones, retrofitting older homes with insulation or
28 appropriate window treatments (i.e., double-paned windows, interior storm windows,

1 etc.) or choosing development sites in quiet areas. For new development, it is
2 anticipated that Riverside County standards could be met and substantial noise
3 impacts could be avoided by incorporating such appropriate mitigation strategies
4 which would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. However, for
5 existing noise-sensitive uses located in areas adjacent to roadways or rail lines, or
6 close to airports or other stationary sources, it may not be possible or feasible to
7 include noise reduction strategies to address interior noise impacts. The County
8 cannot demonstrate at this time that the revised policies and actions in the GPA No.
9 960, as well as the identified mitigation measures, would reduce impacts of each
10 project and upon each project that could be developed under GPA No. 960 to a less
11 than significant level. Even with the incorporation of feasible mitigation measures,
12 this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

13 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.15-168 through 4.15-171

14 3. Impacts: (Impact 4.15.D) Result in a Substantial Temporary or Periodic Increase in
15 Ambient Noise Levels

16 Future development accommodated by the Project would necessitate construction
17 activities which could temporarily exceed applicable Riverside County standards at
18 nearby noise-sensitive receptors. In many cases, the peak sound levels would be
19 extremely brief and overall ambient noise levels would remain within acceptable
20 limits. In addition, buildout accommodated by GPA No. 960 would be required to
21 conform to federal and local regulations regarding noise, including the Federal Noise
22 Control Act of 1972 and Ordinance No. 847 (regulating noise). Further, there are
23 several existing General Plan Noise policies that would provide mitigation for impacts
24 related to construction noise, including Policy N 13.1 (which requires that future
25 development minimize potential impacts of construction noise on adjacent uses
26 within acceptable practices), Policy N 13.2 (which ensures that construction activities
27 are limited to certain hours of operation in order to minimize adverse noise impacts),
28 Policy N 13.3 (which requires developments adjacent to occupied, noise-sensitive uses

1 have a construction noise mitigation plan prepared prior to issuance of a grading
2 permit), and Policy N 13.4 (which requires that all construction equipment utilize
3 noise reduction features (mufflers, engine shrouds, etc.) at least as effective as those
4 originally installed by the manufacturer). Further, applicable mitigation would reduce
5 impacts by requiring the implementation of on-site noise reduction measures during
6 construction. Compliance with the abovementioned existing laws, regulatory
7 programs, and General Plan policies, as well as mitigation measures described below,
8 would also help reduce potential short-term noise impacts. On occasion, however,
9 construction requirements and/or the proximity of the sensitive land use (e.g., within
10 150 feet or less) would make significant noise impacts unavoidable, even though
11 temporary. Because of the close distances involved for such significant impacts,
12 mitigation of sound levels to less than significant are technologically impossible. Thus,
13 no additional Project-specific mitigation is feasible. Future development
14 accommodated by GPA No. 960 may result in significant short-term noise impacts that
15 would be significant and unavoidable.

16 Mitigation:

17 In EIR No. 441, prepared for the 2003 RCIP General Plan, Mitigation Measures 4.13.1A
18 and 4.13.1B were imposed to reduce impacts associated with construction noise
19 generated from development projects to a less than significant level. These measures
20 remain applicable to this Project. Mitigation Measure 4.13.1A would lessen impacts
21 by requiring the preparation and approval of a construction-related noise mitigation
22 plan. Mitigation Measure 4.13.1B would lessen impacts by limiting the time and
23 frequency of construction haul trucks in the area. These mitigation measures would
24 apply to any new developments and would address any construction noise impacts on
25 adjacent existing sensitive uses.

26 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.13.1A states, "Prior to the issuance of any grading
27 plans, the County [of Riverside] shall condition approval of subdivisions adjacent to
28 any developed/occupied noise-sensitive land uses by requiring applicants to submit a

1 construction-related noise mitigation plan to the County for review and approval. The
2 plan should depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from
3 this equipment will be mitigated during construction of the project through use of
4 such methods as:

- 5 • The construction contractor shall use temporary noise attenuation fences
6 where feasible, to reduce construction noise impacts on adjacent noise
7 sensitive land uses.
- 8 • During all project site excavation and grading on site, the construction
9 contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with
10 properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers'
11 standards. The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction
12 equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors
13 nearest the project site.
- 14 • The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will
15 create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and
16 noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project
17 construction.
- 18 • The construction contractor shall limit all construction-related activities that
19 would result in high noise levels to between the hours of 7:00 am and 7:00 pm
20 Monday through Saturday. No construction shall be allowed on Sundays and
21 public holidays."

22 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.13.1B states that the construction-related noise
23 mitigation plan required shall also specify that haul truck deliveries be subject to the
24 same hours specified for construction equipment. Additionally, the plan shall denote
25 any construction traffic haul routes where heavy trucks would exceed 100 daily trips
26 (counting those both to and from the construction site). To the extent feasible, the
27 plan shall denote haul routes that do not pass sensitive land uses or residential
28

1 dwellings. Lastly, the construction-related noise mitigation plan shall incorporate any
2 other restrictions imposed by [Riverside] County staff.

3 Future development accommodated by the Project must include measures to
4 adequately mitigate construction noise impacts. It is feasible that this could be
5 achieved for new development (through site design, buffers, layout, construction
6 materials, increased insulation, etc.). In addition, compliance with the above-listed
7 regulatory programs and General Plan policies, as well as Mitigation Measures
8 4.13.1A and 4.13.1B from EIR No. 441, would further reduce any construction-related
9 impacts to future new development. However, in some cases, particularly where
10 existing noise-sensitive land uses occur within 100-150 feet of certain construction
11 activities (pile driving, demolition, etc.), it may not be possible to reduce construction
12 noise levels to less than significant levels. In these locations, impacts may be
13 significant if the construction noise levels exceed regulatory limits and/or exceed
14 "temporary" duration. In these cases, significant construction impacts would result
15 that cannot be reduced to less than significant levels. Such impacts would be
16 significant and unavoidable.

17 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.15-171 through 4.15-176

18 E. Transportation and Circulation

- 19 1. Impacts: (Impact 4.18.A) Conflict with an Applicable Plan, Ordinance or Policy Establishing
20 a Measure of Effectiveness for the Performance of the Circulation System, Taking into
21 Account All Modes of Transportation, Including Mass Transit and Non-Motorized Travel
22 and Relevant Components of the Circulation System, Including, but Not Limited to
23 Intersections, Streets, Highways and Freeways, Pedestrian and Bicycle Paths and Mass
24 Transit

25 GPA No. 960 proposes to revise the LOS threshold for determining adverse impacts to
26 Riverside County roadways. At present, the countywide threshold for significance is
27 LOS C, with LOS D and E allowed in certain instances. When a roadway facility is
28 projected to operate at a deficient LOS, this situation is often remedied by upgrading

1 the facility designation to a higher classification, thus providing more capacity. By
2 lowering the LOS threshold, fewer facilities would need to be upgraded in order to
3 meet the new proposed LOS target. However, even with the lower LOS threshold and
4 upgrades in roadway classifications, several roadways are still projected to operate at
5 a deficient LOS. In addition, a number of roadways that would operate at an
6 acceptable LOS if their classification were upgraded, cannot be upgraded due to
7 physical or environmental constraints.

8 Future development accommodated by the Project would increase rural, suburban
9 and urban uses in Riverside County relative to existing conditions, and increase travel
10 demand within Riverside County. There are multiple policies which contribute to the
11 reduction of impacts on Riverside County roadways, including Policy C 1.2, which
12 addresses the need to provide a multi-modal transportation network that includes all
13 modes of travel ranging from automobiles to pedestrians. Policy C1.3 specifically
14 addresses transit users by supporting the development of local and regional transit
15 facilities. Policy C 1.7 addresses land use patterns that will reduce vehicular travel
16 such as pedestrian-oriented development and mixed-use community centers. Policy C
17 4.1 relates to the provision of pedestrian facilities within developments. Policy C 2.4
18 requires that new development proposals mitigate their direct traffic impacts.
19 Mitigating cumulative and indirect traffic impact through fee programs and other
20 similar methods is addressed through Policy C 2.5. Policy C 2.7 establishes a trip cap
21 for the Highway 79 Policy Area which requires residential projects to limit their trip
22 generation and provide sufficient infrastructure to support their development.
23 Further, applicable mitigation measures would reduce impacts by requiring a "fair
24 share" contribution for new projects to offset off-site transportation impacts,
25 Compliance with the abovementioned existing laws, rules, regulations and policies,
26 both existing and proposed, together with revisions to the Circulation Element for
27 Riverside County would reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible and practical;
28

1 however, even with these measures impacts to the Riverside County roadway system
2 will be significant and unavoidable.

3 Mitigation:

4 EIR No. 441 was the document used to evaluate the 2003 General Plan. The following
5 mitigations are included in EIR No. 441 with respect to transportation and circulation
6 impacts:

7 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.16.1A states, "As part of its review of land development
8 proposals, The County [of Riverside] shall require project proponents to make a "fair
9 share" contribution to required intersection and/or roadway improvements. The
10 required intersection and/or roadway improvements shall be based on maintaining
11 the appropriate level of service (LOS D within Community Development Areas
12 designated by the 2003 Riverside County General Plan and within adjacent
13 jurisdictions; LOS C within those portions of unincorporated Riverside County outside
14 of Community Development Areas). The fair share contribution shall be based on the
15 percentage of Project-related traffic to the total future traffic."

16 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.16.1B states, "As part of its review of land development
17 proposals, the County [of Riverside], shall ensure sufficient right-of-way is reserved on
18 critical roadways and at critical intersections to implement the approach lane
19 geometrics necessary to provide the appropriate levels of services."

20 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.16.1C states, "The County [of Riverside] shall add a
21 transportation corridor to its General Plan Circulation Element, if feasible, showing a
22 connection between I-15 and the Orange County freeway system, and complete that
23 portion of the CETAP program involving the bi-county corridor to Orange County as a
24 means of relieving traffic congestion along State Route 91 (SR-91). The transportation
25 corridor shall provide an alternative route for traffic on SR-91 between I-15 and State
26 Route 241."

27 GPA No. 960 is in compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.16.1B; however, Mitigation
28 Measure 4.16.1A is affected by the proposed change in the LOS threshold for

1 significance. New policies will impose similar mitigation measures and continue to
2 provide for "fair share" participation in improvement measures to maintain
3 appropriate levels of service. Mitigation Measure 4.16.1C included the bi-county
4 corridor through the Cleveland National Forest. This corridor is not actively being
5 studied by the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), the appropriate
6 public agency charged with making such determinations, at this time and was not
7 included in the modeling for the Project (GPA No. 960). The County has no jurisdiction
8 over the planning for this facility and can no longer count on this facility as mitigation,
9 and as such, the facility is proposed to be removed from the Riverside County
10 Circulation Element. The removal of this facility has been analyzed as part of the
11 traffic modeling to evaluate the impacts of GPA No. 960.

12 Table 4.18-U, "*Mitigation Recommendations for GPA No. 960 (Build Out)*" provided in
13 EIR No. 521, on pages 4.18-91 through 4.18-98 of Section 4.18, "*Transportation and*
14 *Circulation*" summarizes the recommended roadway designation changes needed to
15 mitigate impacted roadway facilities located in the unincorporated areas of Riverside
16 County under the GPA No. 960 Buildout scenario. The table includes the proposed
17 road designation as well as the designation necessary to mitigate roadway impacts.
18 The last column of Table 4.18-U contains Recommendation Codes indicating whether
19 the County of Riverside can adopt the Mitigation Designation for the respective
20 roadway, or if constraint(s) exists that would preclude the County from implementing
21 the Mitigation Designation. The codes are summarized below:

- 22 1. Recommend adoption of mitigation designation.
 - 23 2. Implementation of mitigation would require coordination with other public
24 agencies such as cities, Caltrans, Metropolitan Water District of Southern
25 California (MWD), March JPA, federal agencies, etc.
 - 26 3. Mitigation is affected by design constraints such as terrain, road standard
27 exceptions and geometrics.
- 28

1 4. Implementation of mitigation would require overcoming development constraints
2 such as pre-existing development limiting the ability to acquire right-of-way or
3 provide widening of roads.

4 Of the 153 identified roadways in the table, 99 roadways have mitigation designations
5 recommended for adoption. The remaining 54 roadways require coordination with
6 other jurisdictions and/or are constrained by existing development or environmental
7 considerations. These roadways have the recommendation cells shaded in gray; refer
8 to Table 4.18-U, "*Mitigation Recommendations for GPA No. 960 (Build Out)*" provided
9 in EIR No. 521, on pages 4.18-86 through 4.18-93 of Section 4.18, "*Transportation and*
10 *Circulation*".

11 Table 4.18-U contains all of the roadways that are subject to Riverside County's
12 jurisdiction. All of the other roadways listed fall outside the jurisdiction of Riverside
13 County (i.e. State of California and cities). These roadways similarly have impacts
14 which require mitigation measures. However, since these roadways are not within the
15 jurisdiction of Riverside County, the impacts may potentially remain significant unless
16 improved by others to standards that are higher than those modeled.

17 The implementation of GPA No. 960 will generally improve traffic conditions
18 throughout Riverside County compared to the buildout of the Existing General Plan.
19 This is due to the decreased population estimates, decreased employment estimates,
20 a refined roadway network and implementation of revised policies that provide more
21 realistic parameters for mobility planning. However, the buildout of GPA No. 960 will
22 still result in increased traffic levels in the future that will contribute to deficient
23 operations within its proposed circulation network. The proposed policies
24 incorporated in GPA No. 960 in the Circulation and Land Use Element will partially
25 address these deficient conditions. However, these policies will not fully address these

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 deficiencies, nor will the proposed revisions to the Riverside County Circulation
2 Element fully mitigate these impacts. Therefore, the cumulative impacts to Riverside
3 County roadways are considered to be significant and unavoidable.

4 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.18-44 through 4.18-98

5 F. Water Resources

6 1. Impacts: (Impact 4.19.A) Result in Insufficient Water Supply

7 Future development accommodated by the land use and policy changes proposed by
8 the Project has the potential to result in demand for water supplies where such are
9 insufficient or unavailable to serve the Project from existing entitlements and
10 resources, thus necessitating new or expanded entitlements in order to adequately
11 serve future development, or result in development in locations in which water supply
12 adequacy cannot be ascertained. Due to the unavailability of potable water in some
13 areas, as well as the variability and unpredictability of supply adequacy in light of
14 future growth, as well as environmental and regulatory constraints, adequate water
15 supplies for all forecast future development cannot be assured. As a result, within
16 certain areas of Riverside County where sufficient water supply is not available or
17 cannot be assured into the future, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.
18 However, there are several federal and State regulations that would aid in reducing
19 significant impacts related to insufficient water supplies, including a demonstrated
20 compliance with the Clean Water Act, Federal Safe Drinking Water Act, California
21 Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1970, the California Safe Drinking Water
22 Act, CCR Title 22 (Recycled Water), SBX 7-7, Senate Bill 610, and Senate Bill 221. There
23 are also several existing Riverside County regulations that would prevent or reduce
24 significant impacts to water supplies (refer to page 4.19-296). Further, there are
25 multiple water-resources related General Plan policies that would help reduce the
26 effects of future development on water supply, including Policies OS 1.1 and 1.3
27 (which address water supply issues at the county level and when considering projects
28 for approval), Policies OS 2.2 and 2.5 (which address water conservation by

1 encouraging the use of recycled water), and Policies LU 5.3, 21.2, 28.3, 29.7, 30.7,
2 31.4 and 32.6 (which address project consistency with urban water management
3 plans and require projects be reviewed to ensure water resources are adequate for
4 the proposed level of development). Policies OS 1.4, 2.3 and 2.4 (which address
5 water conservation by encouraging the use of recycled water), New Policies OS 2.1
6 and 18.1-18.6 (which address water conservation through requirements for water-
7 efficient landscaping), and New Policy LU 22.2 (which ensures water resources are
8 adequate for the proposed level of development) would also aid in reducing
9 significant impacts. Compliance with abovementioned existing laws, federal, State and
10 County regulatory programs, General Plan policies and the existing mitigation
11 measures from EIR No. 441 described below, would reduce potential on water supply;
12 however, they do not mitigate the potential significant impacts that would arise from
13 project-driven future increases in demand for and use of water. Impacts remain
14 significant and unavoidable in this regard.

15 Mitigation:

16 These specific mitigation measures from EIR No. 441 address water supplies directly:
17 existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.2A and 4.17.3A (described under Impact 4.19.B,
18 below), would also aid in reducing impacts to water supplies.

19 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.1C "Development within unincorporated areas of
20 the County shall not use water of any source of quality suitable for potable domestic
21 use for non-potable uses, including cemeteries, golf courses, parks, highway
22 landscaped areas, industrial and irrigation uses, or other non-domestic use if suitable
23 recycled water is available as provided in Sections 13550-13566 of the [California]
24 Water Code and/or Sections 65591-65600 and 65601-65607 of the Public Resource
25 Code. Prior to the issuance of any land use permit, the County shall determine to
26 what extent and in which manner the use of recycled water is required for individual
27 water projects. Future development shall be designed, constructed and maintained in
28 accordance with the recycled water measures mandated by the County."

1 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.1D states, "The County [of Riverside] shall enforce
2 compliance with federal, state and local standards for water conservation within
3 residential, commercial or industrial projects. Prior to approval of any development
4 within the County, the applicant shall submit evidence to the County that all
5 applicable water conservation measures have been met."

6 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.1E states, "For any development within the
7 [Department of Water Resources [DWR]-designated] Palo Verde Planning Area
8 supplied with water from the Colorado River, the project applicant shall enter into a
9 contract with the City of Needles [the Lower Colorado Water Supply Project [LCWSP]
10 water contractor], pursuant to the Lower Colorado Water Supply Project program.
11 Evidence of such a contractual agreement shall be submitted to the County prior to
12 the approval of any development entitlement for the project."

13 Implementation of the above regulations, General Plan policies and Existing
14 Mitigation Measure 4.17.1E would reduce or minimize potential impacts to water
15 supply associated with future development accommodated by GPA No. 960. However,
16 they do not fully mitigate potential significant impacts that would arise from Project-
17 driven future increases in demand for and use of water; nor do they provide the
18 means to ensure water supplies are secured for the proposed areas. Thus, even with
19 the above measures, impacts to water supply would remain significant and
20 unavoidable.

21 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.19-293 through 4.19-298

22 2. Impacts: (Impact 4.19.B) Substantially Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere
23 Substantially With Groundwater Recharge

24 Future development accommodated by the land use and policy changes proposed by
25 the Project would increase population size within Riverside County, triggering
26 increased water demands on areas relying on groundwater supplies. This is
27 particularly likely in areas of Riverside County without municipal water service or
28 other access to imported water supplies or where new development would rely solely

on groundwater for supply. Increased and new uses may also conflict with groundwater management plans, monitoring programs or lead to groundwater extractions that individually or cumulatively exceed the groundwater basins' safe yields or cause a net deficit in the aquifer volume or reduction in the local water table level. In addition, there is the potential for future development accommodated by the Project to occur in vacant areas that are currently available for groundwater recharge. Development of such areas would reduce the area available for aquifer recharge and could substantially interfere with the process of groundwater recharge. A number of federal and State regulatory policies and programs address groundwater impacts, including those outlined in the Clean Water Act, Federal Safe Drinking Water Act, California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1970, CCR Title 22 (recycled water), SBX 7-7, Senate Bill 610, and Senate Bill 221. There are also several Riverside County regulations that would play a role in reducing impacts to groundwater, including Ordinance No. 682 (construction, reconstruction, abandonment and destruction of wells), Ordinance No. 856 (establishing a septic tank prohibition for specified areas of Quail Valley and requiring the connection of existing septic systems to sewer), and Ordinance No 871 (prohibiting the installation of specified septic tank systems in Cherry Valley). Further, there are also several existing and proposed General Plan Open Space and Land Use policies that would address potential impacts to water resources (refer to page 4.19-301 for a full discussion of these policies). However, where groundwater recharge is insufficient, such increased demand on aquifers would result in significant and unavoidable impacts.

Mitigation:

Several specific mitigation measures from EIR No. 441 address groundwater supplies and recharge. Existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.1C, 4.17.1D and 4.17.1E, listed under Impact 4.19.A, above, would also aid in reducing impacts to groundwater supplies.

Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.2A states, "In areas where it is not practical to conserve soils suitable for recharge (as determined by the Riverside County Flood

Control and Water Conservation District), water harvesting and recharge facilities shall be built within the same groundwater basin in which the recharge area is lost. The construction of 'replacement' recharge areas shall equal the amount of recharge area lost and/or shall incorporate equipment or facilities capable of replacing (at an equal volume) the amount of groundwater recharge capacity lost as a result of development. The identification, designation, location or installation of 'replacement' groundwater recharge capacity shall be reviewed and approved by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District prior to the issuance of grading permits."

Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.3A states, "New development that includes more than one acre of impervious surface area (including roofs, parking areas, streets, sidewalk, etc.) shall incorporate features to facilitate the onsite infiltration of precipitation and/or runoff into groundwater basins. Such features shall include (but not be limited to): natural drainage systems (where economically feasible), detention basins incorporated into project landscaping; and the installation of porous areas within parking areas. Where natural drainage systems are utilized for groundwater recharge, they shall be managed using natural approaches (as modified to safeguard public health and safety). Groundwater recharge features shall be included on development plans and shall be reviewed by the Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District prior to the issuance of grading permits."

While the above existing mitigation measures from EIR No. 441 would reduce or minimize potential impacts to groundwater usage and its recharge as a result of future development accommodated by GPA No. 960, they do not address specific groundwater basin usage or the site-specific groundwater recharge impacts that would result indirectly from implementation of the proposed Project. In some cases, such onsite recharge mitigation may be infeasible or insufficient to offset the impact to groundwater. In addition, agency data demonstrating groundwater supply and

demand into the future only extends to 2035, thus making supply assumptions for this Project to full buildout (approximately 2060) tenuous at best. Thus, even with the above measures, impacts to groundwater and groundwater recharge would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.19-298 through 4.19-303

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental issues associated with the Riverside County General Plan Update are determined to have no cumulative environmental impacts in consideration of existing regulations:

A. Mineral Resources

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.14.A) Result in the Loss of Availability of Delineated Locally Important Minerals

Since the Riverside County General Plan does not contain any “locally important mineral resource recovery sites,” no cumulative impacts would occur in this regard.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-201

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that the following cumulative environmental impacts associated with the Riverside County General Plan Update are determined to be less than significant in consideration of existing regulations:

A. Land Use

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.2.A: Physically Divide an Established Community , Impact 4.2.B: Conflict With Environmental Land Use Policies Intended to Avoid or Mitigate an Environmental Effect, and 4.2.C: Conflict With Any Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan)

A substantial increase in growth is anticipated to result in the implementation of future GPAs over the next 50 years if all of the changes proposed by GPA No. 960 and the cumulative General Plan scenario occur. These changes and growth pressures will have a direct bearing on land uses within Riverside County. However, the analysis provided in Section 5.5, “Cumulative Impacts” in EIR No. 521 (pages 5-50 through 5-55) indicates that future development consistent with the proposed Project, GPA No.

960, would contribute less than significant incremental impacts on land use-related environmental issues, including physical division of an established community, consistency with land use plans, policies and regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate environmental effects, and consistency with habitat conservation plans. Moreover, compliance with State and County regulations would further prevent already significant impacts to physical access to and through established communities. Additionally, there are several existing and proposed General Plan Policies that would address impacts to established communities (refer to page 4.2-43 for a full discussion of these policies). Implementation of, and compliance with, key regulations, Riverside County ordinances and General Plan policies listed above and on pages 5-57 and 5-59 of General Plan Section 5.5 would ensure that cumulative impacts on land use are either avoided or minimized to less than significant.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-58 and 5-199

B. Population and Housing

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impacts 4.3.B: *Displace Residential Units* and 4.3.C: *Displace People*)

A small number of homes and their residents will be displaced where new development, particularly new highways and major roadways, is constructed on previously developed lands. Such displacements would be insubstantial, however, because of the existing and future housing inventories available within Riverside County for replacement. Displacement would not necessitate the construction of additional replacement housing elsewhere. As a result of population growth and new homes, in particular, the amount of roadways, storm drains, water reservoirs and storage tanks, pipelines, transmission lines and other infrastructure needed within Riverside County would also increase. However, this incremental impact would be insubstantial.

The analysis provided in Section 5.5, "Cumulative Impacts" in EIR No. 521 (pages 5-59 through 5-63) indicates that future development consistent with the proposed Project, GPA No. 960, would contribute less than significant incremental impacts on

1 population and housing-related environmental issues, including the displacement of
2 residential units and people. Policy LU 8.1 ensures that future development be
3 developed in a balanced manner, and LU 9.4 allows clustering to facilitate growth
4 without adversely affecting sensitive resources. Policy C 2.4 requires new
5 development, which includes residential, to provide necessary circulation
6 improvements to ensure adequate levels of service, and Policy C 7.9 ensures that
7 future development, which includes residential, does not impinge upon lands needed
8 for future circulation service. Moreover, implementation of, and compliance with, key
9 regulations, Riverside County ordinances and General Plan policies described above
10 and on page 5-60 of General Plan Section 5.5 would ensure that cumulative impacts
11 regarding displacement of residential units and people are either avoided or
12 minimized to less than significant.

13 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-60 and 5-62 through 5-63

14 C. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

15 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.5.C) Adversely Affect Forest Lands and Forestry Uses

16 Table 5.5-M, "Cumulative Biological Effects" on pages 5-92 through 5-93 in Section 5.5
17 of EIR No. 521 provides data on cumulative effects to woodland and forest acreage
18 throughout Riverside County. This data indicates that land use changes occurring as
19 the General Plan builds out (regardless of scenario) will affect only sporadic or
20 occasional stands of forest vegetation at altitudes above 5,000 feet sea level. This
21 includes stands of "Montane Hardwood" and "Montane Hardwood-Conifer Forest,"
22 primarily in the San Jacinto Mountains of central Riverside County. None of these
23 forest resources, however, support industrial or commercial timber production.
24 Overall, compliance with existing and proposed State and County regulations and
25 policies listed earlier in the document would ensure forestry impacts are less than
26 significant. The California Forest Practice Act would ensure any future timberland uses
27 within Riverside County are conducted according to the standards established by the
28 State of California for the protection and safe utilization of forest lands and timber

resources. County Ordinance No. 559 protects forest and timber resources within the County by requiring review and issuance of a permit for the removal of living native trees on parcels or property greater than one-half acre and located above 5,000 feet elevation. In addition, there are several existing and proposed/revised General Plan Land Use and Open Space policies ensuring that development impacts on forest lands, including their conversion to non-forest uses, are less than significant. Neither the Project nor the cumulative General Plan buildout scenarios would result in significant cumulative forestry impacts. No mitigation is required.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-70 to 5-71 and 5-92 through 5-93

D. Biological Resources

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.8.E) Conflict with Adopted Habitat Conservation Plans

The with-Project General Plan buildout scenario will further increase habitat loss to development and urbanization in general, though in incremental amounts generally not substantial. Of particular note, the with-Project General Plan buildout scenario would add over 9,200 additional acres of natural habitat within vacant and open space uses. For the cumulative General Plan buildout, the incremental losses of native habitat and gains in developed acreage continue in larger, but still incrementally insignificant amounts. In particular when compared against the offsetting habitat conservation targets to be achieved throughout Western Riverside County and Coachella Valley MSHCPs, the incremental effects of habitat loss for the Project and cumulative scenarios are not cumulatively significant. Additionally, there are several existing and proposed General Plan policies that would lessen conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Compliance with the provisions of these MSHCPs, in addition to the federal, State, and County regulations and General Plan policies described previously in the document would ensure that future development accommodated by GPA No. 960 is consistent

1 with the plans and that cumulative impacts are less than significant. Therefore, no
2 mitigation is required.

3 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-97 through 5-98

4 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.8.F) Conflict with Local Biological Resource Protections
5 Policies or Ordinances

6 Similar to Project impacts discussed above, the cumulative General Plan buildout
7 scenario would increase rural, suburban and urban uses in the County that could
8 result in conflicts with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources;
9 however, the incremental effects are not considered to be cumulatively significant.
10 The Riverside County Oak Tree Management Guidelines and Riverside County
11 Ordinance No. 559 – Regulating the Removal of Trees both prevent conflicts with local
12 biological resource regulations. In addition, Policies OS 9.3 and 9.4 provide for the
13 maintenance and preservation of natural trees and vegetation, including oak trees, for
14 ecosystem, aesthetic, and water conservation purposes. Compliance with the
15 abovementioned existing laws, federal, State, and County regulatory programs,
16 Riverside County Ordinance No. 559, and General Plan policies would be sufficient to
17 further ensure that cumulative impacts are less than significant. No mitigation is
18 required in this regard.

19 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-99

20 E. Flood and Dam Inundation Hazards

21 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.11.C) Expose People or Structures to Flooding Risks,
22 Including Flooding Due to Dam or Levee Failure

23 Future development within Riverside County (regardless of scenario) also has the
24 potential to incrementally introduce people, property, public facilities, roads and
25 other infrastructure into areas potentially at risk of dam inundation or flooding due to
26 other sources, e.g., failure of a levee or of a debris basin above an alluvial fan. As with
27 100-year floodplain effects, without measures that reduce flooding risks, this impact
28 would be potentially cumulatively considerable. However, compliance with existing

1 federal, State and County regulations and programs, as previously described above as
2 well as on pages 5-116 through 5-117 of EIR No. 521 Section 5.5, would ensure that
3 risks associated with development in dam inundation zones and other areas
4 potentially prone to flooding or inundation hazards due to failure of a flood control
5 facility are less than significant. These regulations include, but are not limited to,
6 various Riverside County ordinances including Ordinance No. 458 (as it pertains to
7 standards for flood control structures), as well as Ordinances No. 348, 457, 659 and
8 461. In addition, several existing and proposed new or revised General Plan Policies
9 would lessen potential dam inundation hazards associated with future development.
10 As such, No mitigation is required.

11 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-114 and 5-116 through 5-117.

12 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.11.D) Cause the Adverse Alteration of Drainage Patterns or
13 Substantially Increase Surface Runoff

14 Future development would result in the incremental alteration of drainage patterns
15 throughout Riverside County that would contribute to cumulative changes in drainage
16 patterns, runoff and hydrological alterations. In addition to direct drainage
17 alterations, temporary ponding or flooding could also result from development
18 activities, reducing the water-carrying capacity of drainages, flood control facilities,
19 storm drains, etc. Such drainage alterations and changes in runoff conditions must be
20 reduced to prevent serious cumulative flooding risks.

21 Future development would also result in new land uses that would convert permeable
22 surfaces (such as undisturbed soils and vacant lands) to impermeable surfaces, such
23 as buildings (rooftops), parking lots and roadways. Increased impermeable surfaces
24 would substantially alter the existing drainage patterns by incrementally increasing
25 surface runoff, thereby increasing flooding hazards. Impermeable surfaces and
26 development would also divert natural runoff patterns potentially resulting in
27 flooding. Developed areas where much of the land surface is covered by roads,
28 buildings and other impermeable structures have little capacity to store rainfall. As a

1 result of accelerated runoff from disturbed areas, peak discharge, volume and
2 frequency of floods increases incrementally in nearby streams. To prevent this urban
3 runoff from creating flood hazards, future development must be designed to direct
4 and channel runoff appropriately into storm drain facilities adequately sized to handle
5 expected flows. Such measures are, in fact, included as Conditions of Approval
6 required for implementing projects; see the regulatory compliance measures listed
7 above under Impact 4.11.D as well as on pages 5-116 and 5-117 in Section 5.5 of EIR
8 No. 521. Compliance with the existing federal, State and County regulations would
9 ensure that risks associated with alterations of drainage patterns or increased surface
10 runoff impacts would be less than significant. These regulations include, but are not
11 limited to, the Clean Water Act, NPDES program, and various Riverside County
12 ordinances including Ordinance No. 457, Ordinance No. 458, Ordinance No. 461 and
13 Ordinance 754. In addition, compliance with existing General Plan Policies S 4.4, S 4.5,
14 S 4.8, S 4.9 and S 4.10 would further ensure that flooding hazards would be less than
15 significant. As such, no mitigation is required.

16 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-114 and 5-116 through 5-117

17 F. Geology and Soils

18 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.12.F) Result in Development on Unstable Geological Units
19 or Soils

20 In terms of development on unstable geologic units and soils, as well as expansive
21 soils, future growth may incrementally increase the potential for structure damage or
22 interruption of utility service (through disruption of the facility). However, such
23 impacts are not considered cumulatively considerable since the regulatory compliance
24 measures identified above under Impact 4.12.F as well as on page 5-125 in Section 5.5
25 of EIR No. 521 would ensure that impacts are avoided, reduce or minimized to less
26 than significant levels. As such, no mitigation is required.

27 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-124 through 5-127
28

1 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.12.H) Result in Development on Soils Incapable of
2 Supporting Septic Tanks or Alternative Wastewater Disposal Systems

3 Cumulative impacts to subsurface sewer services would be avoided, reduced or
4 minimized to less than significant levels with implementation of regulatory
5 compliance measures identified above under Impact 4.12.H as well as on page 5-125
6 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521. These measures would ensure that impacts are avoided,
7 reduce or minimized to less than significant levels. No mitigation is required.

8 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-125

9 G. Hazardous Materials and Safety

10 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.13.A) Create a Significant Hazard Through the Routine
11 Transport, Use of Disposal of Hazardous Materials

12 Future cumulative development would introduce more people, property and
13 structures to potential hazards as a result of the routine transport, use or disposal of
14 hazardous materials, for example through toxic spills or other contamination events.
15 However, compliance with key regulations and programs previously discussed above,
16 as well as on pages 5-134 and 5-135 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521, would be sufficient
17 to reduce cumulative (incremental) impacts to a less than significant level. No
18 mitigation is required.

19 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-134 through 5-135

20 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.13.B) Cause a Significant Hazard Through the Accidental
21 Release of Hazardous Materials

22 Effects from the accidental release of a hazardous material into the environment
23 could have serious consequences on the environment, property and human health
24 depending upon the size, location, type and quantity of the release. However,
25 hazardous material uses, siting, transport and disposal are subject to extensive federal
26 and state regulation and permit requirements. These measures ensure that risks are
27 minimized, regardless of location. Thus, buildout of Riverside County, regardless of
28

General Plan scenario, would not result in cumulatively considerable hazardous material effects due to accidental release.

As discussed above, under Cumulative Impact 4.13.A, a number of federal, State and local regulations exist that would ensure that any future risks from the accidental release hazardous materials would be less than significant. There are a number of federal laws that regulate hazardous materials, including federal laws such as SARA addressing Superfund sites, RCRA and HMTA for hazardous waste disposal, tracking and transportation, OSHA, TSCA and also the federal Clean Air Act. Implementation of and compliance with CCR Titles 22, 26 and 27, as well as Riverside County Ordinances No. 615, 617, 651, 718 and 348 would help monitor and reduce the potential risks to future development resulting from GPA No. 960 for the reasons discussed under Impact 4.13.A, above. No mitigation is required.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-132 through 5-134

3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.13.C) Result in Hazardous Emissions or Related Hazards Within One-Quarter Mile of a School

Future development would also increase the potential for hazardous emissions or related hazards within one-quarter mile of a school, both by increasing use of hazardous substances near existing schools and by introducing new schools potentially into proximity of hazardous materials. However, hazardous material uses, siting, transport and disposal are subject to extensive federal and state regulation and permit requirements, which are briefly described above under Impact 4.13.C. These measures ensure that risks are minimized, regardless of location. Thus, buildout of Riverside County, regardless of General Plan scenario, would not result in cumulatively considerable hazardous material effects due to accidental release. Compliance with key regulations and programs discussed on pages 5-134 and 5-135 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521 would be sufficient to reduce cumulative (incremental) impacts to a less than significant level. No mitigation is required.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-134 through 5-135

1 4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.13.D) Result in a Significant Hazard Due to Development
2 on a Cortese List Hazardous Materials Site

3 Future development would also increase the potential for hazards due to
4 development on or near a site on the State of California's Cortese List of
5 contaminated sites, leaking underground storage tanks, hazardous waste sites, etc. As
6 discussed in Cumulative Impacts 4.13A, B, and C, above, hazardous material uses,
7 siting, transport and disposal are subject to extensive federal and state regulation and
8 permit requirements, which ensure that risks are minimized, regardless of location.
9 Compliance with key regulations and programs discussed both above and on pages 5-
10 134 and 5-135 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521 would be sufficient to reduce cumulative
11 (incremental) impacts regarding Cortese List hazardous material sites to a less than
12 significant level. No mitigation is required.

13 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-134 through 5-135

14 5. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.13.E) Result in Safety Hazard for People Within Two Miles
15 of a Public or Public Use Airport

16 Future development would introduce more people, property and structures to
17 potential hazards as a result of their proximity (generally within 2 miles) to public use
18 airports, military air bases, etc. An unforeseeable air accident could result in
19 substantial loss of life or property damage, even within the safety zones outlined in
20 the General Plan and the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
21 (ALUCP). However, compliance with applicable County of Riverside and ALUC
22 regulations described previously under Impact 4.13.E would ensure that air hazard
23 risks to the areas affected by cumulative future development would be minimized to
24 less than significant levels. Cumulative (incremental) impacts would be non-
25 substantial, and no mitigation would be required.

26 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-134

27 ///

28 ///

6. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.13.F) Result in a Safety Hazard for People in the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip or Heliport

Future development would introduce more people, property and structures to potential hazards as a result of their proximity (generally within 2 miles) to private air strips and heliports. An unforeseeable air accident could result in substantial loss of life or property damage, even within the safety zones outlined in the General Plan and the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). However, compliance with the applicable County of Riverside and ALUC regulations described previously under Impact 4.13.F would ensure that air hazard risks to the areas affected by cumulative future development would be minimized to less than significant levels. Cumulative (incremental) impacts would be non-substantial, and no mitigation would be required.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-134

7. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.13.G) Impair or Interfere With an Adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan

Future development would result in more people and their vehicles needing to evacuate an area in the event of an emergency, particularly for wildfires. This additional traffic could hinder emergency response plans for public safety personnel and equipment in a disaster or emergency. However, construction of new roads and connecting road segments that would occur as part of the cumulative General Plan buildout would improve circulation and access, subsequently facilitating evacuations and emergency responses. As such, cumulatively substantial impacts that would interfere with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would not occur; incremental impacts are anticipated to be less than significant. In addition, compliance with key safety regulations and programs discussed previously under

///

///

///

Impact 4.13.G, as well as on pages 5-134 and 5-135 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521 would ensure that cumulative impacts would remain less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-134 through 5-135

H. Mineral Resources

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.14.B) Result in the Loss of Availability of Known Mineral Resources

Future development will contribute incrementally to cumulative mineral resource and mining impacts as Riverside County builds out over time pursuant to the Riverside County General Plan (regardless of scenario). Specific impacts include the following:

- Future development pursuant to any of the General Plan buildout scenarios, including that with the Project, will contribute incrementally, but not significantly, to the loss of availability of known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State of California, including within Sectors containing significant aggregate resources.
- Future development would also contribute incrementally, but not significantly, to the loss of lands where the availability and/or economic viability of mineral resources has yet to be established (for example, MRZ-3, MRZ-4 or unstudied areas).
- Indirect incremental impacts could also occur where MRZ-2 lands are encroached upon by incompatible uses, particularly residences and other sensitive uses, and where development lies adjacent to MRZ-2 sites otherwise suitable for mining.
- The incremental loss of areas with potentially viable mineral resources could also result in the need for development of mineral resources further away from the locations where they would be used. This would result in additional incremental contributions to other cumulative effects, such as traffic, air pollutants, noise and loss of biological habitat.

1 However, implementation of key regulations and General Plan policies described
2 previously under Impact 4.14.B above, as well as those provided on page 5-139 and 5-
3 140 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521 would be sufficient to ensure that all of the
4 incremental impacts listed above would be less than significant. As such, the Project's
5 incremental impacts to mineral resources and their availability would not be
6 cumulatively substantial. Therefore, significant cumulative impacts to known mineral
7 resources of regional or statewide significance would be either avoided or minimized
8 to less than significant. No mitigation is required.

9 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-139 through 5-140

10 I. Parks and Recreation

11 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.16.B) *Trigger Growth Effects Resulting in the Need for*
12 *Additional Parks or Recreational Facilities*

13 Table 5.5-W, "*Cumulative Theoretical Parkland Effects*" on page 5-150 in Section 5.5
14 of EIR No. 521 provides an analysis of theoretical park acreage needs based on
15 population predictions for each buildout scenario. General Plan buildout will
16 contribute incrementally to growth in populations throughout Riverside County which
17 will utilize existing recreational facilities and add to the demand for additional
18 recreational uses. Even with no project, buildout of the current General Plan shows
19 that over 3,400 acres of additional parklands, more than double the existing amount,
20 will be necessary to serve expected urban/suburban populations. The Project would
21 incrementally increase the need for parklands by 2% (80 acres), and the cumulative
22 General Plan buildout scenario would also incrementally add 50 acres. Neither of
23 these increases is cumulatively considerable in terms of demand for additional
24 parklands. Compliance with the abovementioned existing State and Riverside County
25 regulatory programs (the Quimby Act, specifically), as well as existing General Plan

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 policies, would ensure cumulative impacts to parks, trails and other recreation would
2 be less than significant. Therefore, a less than significant cumulative impact would
3 occur, and no mitigation is required.

4 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-150 through 5-151

5 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.16.C) Result in Significant Adverse Environmental Effects
6 Due to the Need for Additional Parks or Recreational Facilities

7 Incremental population growth over time will necessitate construction of new or
8 expansion of existing parks and recreational facilities. The construction or expansion
9 of such facilities could have an adverse physical effect on the environment. However,
10 compliance with existing regulations, Riverside County ordinances, and General Plan
11 policies, described above,” would be sufficient to ensure that resultant cumulative
12 environmental impacts associated with the need for construction or expansion of new
13 or physically altered parks or recreational facilities are less than significant. No
14 mitigation is required in this regard.

15 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-151

16 J. Transportation and Circulation

17 1. Cumulative Impact: (4.18.C) Result in a Change in Air Traffic Patterns, Including Either an
18 Increase in Traffic Levels or a Change in Location that Results in Substantial Safety Risks

19 Future growth within Riverside County as a result of any of the General Plan buildout
20 scenarios will contribute incrementally to changes in air traffic patterns, including
21 increases in air traffic at some airport locations and expansion of air services or
22 facilities at some airports. The increase or expansion of air operations will
23 incrementally increase the areas potentially at risk from air-related safety hazards.
24 Such incremental increases, however, would be non-substantial and would not be
25 cumulatively significant. Further, no new airports or expansions are included in GPA
26 No. 960.

27 Compliance with the existing laws, rules and regulations described above under
28 “Project Impacts,” including the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan,

would be sufficient to ensure that this cumulative impact is less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-175

2. Cumulative Impact: (4.18.D) Alter Waterborne or Rail Traffic

Future growth within Riverside County as a result of any of the General Plan buildout scenarios will contribute incrementally, but non-substantially, to increased demand for rail and air travel and increased use of these systems. Waterborne travel effects will be minimal (and not individually or cumulatively significant) as recreational water uses are the only type occurring in Riverside County; there are no navigable waterways used in Riverside County. Any incremental increases in usage that would occur in association with GPA No. 960 would be non-substantial and not cumulatively significant. Further, no new air, rail or water facilities are included in GPA No. 960.

Compliance with the existing laws, rules and regulations described above under "Project Impacts" would be sufficient to ensure that this cumulative impact is less than significant. No mitigation is required in this regard.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-175

3. Cumulative Impact: (4.18.E) Substantially Increase Hazards Due to a Design Feature (e.g., Sharp Curves or Dangerous Intersections) or Incompatible Uses (e.g., Farm Equipment)

Future growth within Riverside County as a result of any of the General Plan buildout scenarios will contribute incrementally to increases in road hazards due to design issues or incompatible uses. These incremental hazards, however, will be avoided, reduced or minimized to cumulatively less than significant levels through adherence to Riverside County Transportation design, engineering, construction, operation and maintenance standards.

Compliance with the existing laws, rules and regulations described above under

///

///

///

1 "Project Impacts" as well as those described within General Plan Section 4.18.E would
2 be sufficient to ensure that this cumulative impact is less than significant. No
3 mitigation is required.

4 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-176

5 4. Cumulative Impact: (4.18.F) Cause an Effect Upon, or a Need for New or Altered
6 Maintenance of Roads

7 Roadway improvements to existing roads plus the addition of new roads will
8 incrementally increase the need for and demand upon roadway maintenance. Such
9 increases will not be cumulatively significant, however, according to Section 4.18. As
10 indicated in the "Project Impacts" discussion regarding Impact 4.18.F above, a process
11 exists that will ensure that proper road maintenance is supported by the demand
12 levels which contribute to maintenance revenue, making the cumulative impact less
13 than significant.

14 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-176

15 5. Cumulative Impact: (4.18.G) Cause an Effect Upon Circulation During the Project's
16 Construction

17 Future growth within Riverside County (pursuant to any of the buildout scenarios,
18 including the with-Project, will trigger roadway improvements and new road
19 construction that will have short-term, non-substantial cumulative impacts on
20 portions of the roadway network and the travelers that use it. As indicated in the
21 "Project Impacts" discussion regarding Impact 4.18.G above, General Plan policies will
22 ensure that "traffic circulation [will be] maintained and impacts... maintained at less-
23 than-significant levels." Use of the Riverside County Transportation Improvement
24 Plan (TIP), in particular, to establish and prioritize the timing and construction of
25 Riverside County roadway projects will ensure such cumulative impacts are less than
26 significant.

27 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-176
28

1 6. Cumulative Impact: (4.18.H) Result in Inadequate Emergency Access or Access to Nearby
2 Uses

3 Where incremental traffic increases cause roadway segments to operate below
4 applicable standards, the resultant congestion could indirectly affect the safety and
5 well-being of residents and visitors to Riverside County by delaying response times for
6 emergency services, such as ambulances, fire trucks and law enforcement. Similarly,
7 delays to trucks and other goods movement could slow delivery schedules and
8 increase the cost of shipping through greater fuel consumption. These delays,
9 however, are not expected to be cumulatively considerable overall for GPA No. 960.

10 Similarly, increased traffic congestion, reduced operating levels and construction
11 impacts would also incrementally contribute to inadequate emergency access at times
12 for any of the buildout scenarios. Such incremental increases will be non-substantial
13 and not cumulatively significant however, as GPA No. 960 incorporates policies to
14 ensure adequate emergency vehicle access according to the "Project Impacts"
15 discussion above regarding Impact 4.18.H as well as in Section 4.18.5 of EIR No. 521.

16 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-176

17 7. Cumulative Impact: (4.18.I) Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans or Programs Regarding
18 Public Transit, Bikeways or Pedestrian Facilities, or Otherwise Substantially Decrease the
19 Performance or Safety of Such Facilities

20 Where incremental traffic increases cause roadway segments to operate below
21 applicable standards, the resultant congestion could result in delays to mass transit
22 services (namely, buses), which would delay commuters' transit times and possibly
23 cause fare increases to cover increased fuel costs (if passed on to customers). These
24 delays, however, are not expected to be cumulatively considerable overall.

25 Future growth within Riverside County as a result of any of the buildout scenarios,
26 including the with-Project scenario, will incrementally increase the demand for and
27 use of public transit, bikeways and pedestrian facilities. These increases will not be
28 cumulatively considerable, however, because, as pointed out in the "Project Impacts"

discussion regarding Impact 4.18.I above, as well as in Section 4.18.5 of EIR No. 521, GPA No. 960 incorporates policies to ensure adequate transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. These policies, described above in "4.18.I Impacts" will also ensure that the performance and safety of such facilities are likewise maintained. Therefore, this cumulative impact is considered less than significant.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-176

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that the following cumulative environmental impacts associated with the Riverside County General Plan Update are potentially significant unless otherwise indicated, but each of these impacts will be avoided or substantially lessened to a level of less than significant by the identified existing regulations or mitigation measures specified in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) which is incorporated herein by this reference. Accordingly, the County makes the following finding as to each of the following impacts pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a): "Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR."

A. Aesthetics and Visual Resources

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.4.C) Adversely Affect Existing Visual Character

Future development per any of the buildout scenarios would contribute incrementally to changing the visual character of Riverside County over time. However, implementation of key regulations, General Plan policies and mitigation measures discussed above in "Project Impacts," as well as those on pages 5-68 and 5-69 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521, would be sufficient to ensure that the incremental (non-substantial) cumulative impacts to the existing visual character would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Cumulative Mitigation:

Existing Mitigation Measure 4.4.A-N1, discussed above, is also applicable to cumulative impacts related to existing visual character. This Mitigation Measure

would be sufficient to ensure that incremental (non-substantial) cumulative impacts to existing visual character remain less than significant.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-68 through 5-69

2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.4.E) *Interfere with Nighttime Use of the Palomar Astronomical Observatory*

Table 5.5-F, "Cumulative Palomar Lighting Zone Effects," on page 5-65 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521, shows how each of the General Plan buildout scenarios (including cumulative) would incrementally affect light and glare levels within Riverside County relative to the Palomar Special Lighting Zones established under Riverside County Ordinance No. 655. Due to its proximity, excessive lighting from future development occurring within Zone A in particular (0 to 15-mile radius) has the greatest potential to incrementally affect observatory operations. Because of the additive nature of light, such incremental contributions would be cumulatively significant. However, implementation of the key regulations, General Plan policies and mitigation measures discussed above under "Project Impacts," as well on pages 5-68 and 5-69 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521 would be sufficient to ensure that the incremental (non-substantial) cumulative impacts to nighttime use of the Palomar Astronomical Observatory would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Cumulative Mitigation:

Existing Mitigation Measures 4.4.2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, and 2E, discussed above, are also applicable to cumulative impacts related to nighttime use of the Palomar Astronomical Observatory. These Mitigation Measures would be sufficient to ensure that incremental (non-substantial) cumulative impacts to nighttime use of the Palomar Astronomical Observatory are reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-68 through 5-69

///

///

///

1 B. Air Quality

2 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.6.E) Cause or Expose People to Objectionable Odors

3 Although almost any land use has the potential to emit odors, some land uses, such as
4 chemical plants, composting operations, dairies, certain agricultural activities,
5 landfills, etc., are more likely to produce odors because of their operations. For such
6 uses, however, setbacks or buffers, and other site-specific and industry-specific
7 measures are typically required to control odors. Although incremental odor
8 emissions would result, such uses are not typically allowed to be developed in
9 concentrations that would yield cumulatively considerable impacts.

10 Construction activities associated with Project implementation would generate
11 airborne odors as a result of operation of construction vehicles (i.e., diesel exhaust),
12 paving with hot asphalt and the application of architectural coatings. Because of the
13 volatile nature of odor compounds, they either react quickly in the atmosphere or are
14 diluted as they are carried away from the odor source. Therefore, construction odors
15 are generally isolated and limited to the duration of construction and its immediate
16 site vicinity. As such, they would not affect a substantial number of people as impacts
17 related to these odors are limited to the number of people living and working nearby
18 the source. Further, while some components of asphalt and diesel emissions are
19 considered toxic air contaminants, construction activities do not generally cause
20 significant odor impacts because of the duration of exposure. Future buildout of any
21 of the various General Plan scenarios, including the proposed Project, would not have
22 cumulatively significant impacts due to odors.

23 Implementation of key regulations, General Plan policies and mitigation measures
24 discussed previously under "Project Impacts," as well as on pages 5-81 through 5-87
25 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521, would be sufficient to ensure that the incremental (non-
26 substantial) cumulative impacts regarding objectionable odors would be reduced to
27 less than significant levels.

1 Cumulative Mitigation:

2 New Mitigation Measures 4.6.E-N1, N2 and N3, described above, are also applicable
3 to cumulative impacts related to objectionable odors. These Mitigation Measures
4 would be sufficient to ensure that incremental (non-substantial) cumulative impacts
5 regarding objectionable odors are reduced to less than significant levels.

6 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-81 to 5-87

7 C. Biological Resources

8 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.8.A) Adversely Affect Riparian and Other Sensitive Habitats

9 Spatial analyses were performed to examine the cumulative results of General Plan
10 buildout on biological resources. To encapsulate the scope of impacts resulting from
11 buildout of Riverside County, the various General Plan buildout scenarios were
12 analyzed against the natural communities mapped within Riverside County (refer to
13 General Plan Figures OS-4a, 4b and 4c). These land use and habitat analyses reflect
14 the range of impacts to species, as site-specific or species-specific surveys are well
15 beyond the scope of the programmatic EIR No. 521. Table 5.5-M, "*Cumulative*
16 *Biological Effects in Unincorporated Riverside County*" on pages 5-96 and 5-97 in
17 Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521, shows the cumulative conditions for the three General Plan
18 buildout scenarios examined Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521: the existing (2009) General
19 Plan, the General Plan updated per the Project, and the cumulative General Plan as
20 per the additional proposed GPAs through 2009.

21 Growth pressures within Riverside County will result in development that causes the
22 incremental loss, fragmentation and degeneration of natural habitat regardless of the
23 General Plan buildout scenario. Per Table 5.5-M, General Plan buildout will contribute
24 incrementally to the loss of species and habitat within Riverside County and result in
25 varying degrees of impacts, depending on the size, scope and location of the
26 incremental future development. Under buildout of the current (2009) General Plan,
27 the amount of disturbed and developed land overall would increase 20% countywide.
28 This includes increases in urban/suburban uses of roughly 32% (25,700 acres) and a

1 doubling of interface/wildland uses, approximately 1.5 million acres. Due to greater
2 accuracy in mapping, public facility uses would decrease nearly 10%, which is a gain of
3 roughly 2,400 acres of mainly undisturbed habitat. These land use changes show
4 similar trends across the various natural communities; that is, habitat acreage within
5 vacant/open uses decreasing and in urban/suburban and, in particular,
6 interface/wildland uses increasing.

7 Future development accommodated will contribute incrementally to cumulative
8 biological impacts, including adverse effects to riparian and other sensitive habitats,
9 as Riverside County builds out over time pursuant to the Riverside County General
10 Plan (regardless of scenario). However, a variety of existing regulatory compliance and
11 specific mitigation measures would be implemented to avoid, reduce and minimize
12 adverse cumulative biological impacts. The key regulations and programs and General
13 Plan policies are provided previously under the "Project Impacts" section of this
14 document, as well as on pages 5-99 through 5-102 in Section 5.5 of EIR No 521, and
15 the mitigation is provided below.

16 Cumulative Mitigation:

17 New Mitigation Measures 4.8.A-N1 and 4.8.A-N2, described above, are also applicable
18 to cumulative impacts. These measures would be sufficient to reduce incremental
19 cumulative impacts to riparian and other sensitive habitats to a level that is less than
20 significant.

21 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-97 through 5-102

22 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.8.B) Cause Direct and Indirect Impacts to Protected Species
23 or Their Habitats

24 Future development accommodated as Riverside County builds out over time,
25 pursuant to the Riverside County General Plan (regardless of scenario), will contribute
26 incrementally to cumulative biological impacts, including direct take of species (that
27 is, kill, harass, harm, etc.), including species protected by law (threatened or
28 endangered under the federal or California Endangered Species Act), as well as

species otherwise protected or identified as sensitive (e.g., within the WR-MSHCP or CV-MSHCP, etc.), and indirect impacts to these species. However, as described above under the "Project Impacts" section of this document, a variety of existing regulatory compliance and specific mitigation measures would be implemented to avoid, reduce and minimize adverse cumulative biological impacts. The key regulations and programs and General Plan policies are also provided on pages 5-99 in Section 5.5 of EIR No 521, and the mitigation is provided below.

Cumulative Mitigation:

New Mitigation Measure 4.8.B-N1, described above, is also applicable to cumulative impacts. This measure would be sufficient to reduce incremental cumulative impacts to protected species or their habitats to a level that is less than significant.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-98 through 5-102

3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.8.C) Adversely Affect Wetlands

Future development accommodated as Riverside County builds out over time, pursuant to the Riverside County General Plan (regardless of scenario), will contribute incrementally to cumulative biological impacts, including adverse effects to (including loss of) wetlands and riparian habitat through direct removal, fill or hydrological interruption; or indirectly through topographic changes, alteration of soils, slopes or hydrology. However, a variety of existing regulatory compliance and specific mitigation measures would be implemented to avoid, reduce and minimize adverse cumulative biological impacts. The key regulations and programs and General Plan policies are provided above beneath the "Project Impacts" section of this document as well as on page 5-99 in Section 5.5 of EIR No 521, and the mitigation is provided below.

Cumulative Mitigation:

New Mitigation Measures 4.8.C-N1 and 4.8.C-N2, described above, are also applicable

///

///

1 to cumulative impacts. These measures would be sufficient to reduce incremental
2 cumulative impacts to wetlands to a level that is less than significant.

3 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-98 through 5-99 and 5-101 through 5-102

4 4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.8.D) *Impede Species Movement, Migration, Wildlife*
5 *Corridors and Use of Wildlife Nursery Sites*

6 Future development accommodated as Riverside County builds out over time,
7 pursuant to the Riverside County General Plan (regardless of scenario), will contribute
8 incrementally to cumulative biological impacts, including adverse effects to (including
9 loss of) areas used for the movement of both resident and migratory native species of
10 fish and wildlife. This includes loss of wildlife corridors and open space lands
11 connecting natural habitat areas, as well as the use of wildlife nursery and hibernation
12 sites. However, a variety of existing regulatory compliance and specific mitigation
13 measures would be implemented to avoid, reduce and minimize adverse cumulative
14 biological impacts. The key regulations and programs and General Plan policies are
15 provided above in the "Project Impacts" section of this document, as well as on pages
16 5-99 in Section 5.5 of EIR No 521, and the mitigation is provided below.

17 Cumulative Mitigation:

18 New Mitigation Measure 4.8.D-N1, described above, is also applicable to cumulative
19 impacts. This measure would be sufficient to reduce incremental cumulative impacts
20 to species movement, migration, wildlife corridors, or use of wildlife nursery sites, to
21 a level that is less than significant.

22 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-98 through 5-99 and 5-102

23 D. Energy Resources

24 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.10.C) *Cause the Inefficient Use of Energy*

25 As outlined in EIR No. 521 Section 4.7, "Greenhouse Gases," implementation of
26 specific building energy-efficiency standards outlined in Riverside County's proposed
27 Climate Action Plan and other energy-related measures affecting electricity supplies,
28 are documented to reduce 2020 electricity demands by nearly half (48%). A full

discussion of these measures, including their relationship to existing and proposed energy conservation efforts of both the State of California and the County of Riverside, is provided above in the "Project Impacts" section of this document, as well as in EIR No. 521 Section 4.7. Implementation of Existing Mitigation Measure 4.8.1B would ensure that potential impacts resulting from the Project and cumulative General Plan buildout scenarios remain less than significant.

Cumulative Mitigation:

Existing Mitigation Measure 4.8.1B states, "The County [of Riverside] shall review all development plans prior to approval to guarantee that energy conservation and efficiency standards of Title 24 are met and are incorporated into the design of the future proposed projects. Implementation of this measure would reduce cumulative impacts regarding inefficient use of energy to a less than significant level.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-110 through 5-112

E. Flood and Dam Inundation Hazards

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.11.A) Result in Housing Within Flood Hazard Areas

Future development accommodated will contribute incrementally to cumulative flooding and inundation impacts as Riverside County builds out over time pursuant to the Riverside County General Plan (regardless of scenario). Encroachment into areas of mapped 100-year floods (including some alluvial fans) and other delineated flood hazards areas may occur; these encroaching land uses would incrementally increase the people, structures and property at risk from a flooding event. However, with the regulatory and mitigation measures proposed (refer to the "Project Impacts" section of this document, for a complete discussion of these measures), cumulative impacts would be avoided, reduced or minimized to non-substantial levels.

Cumulative Mitigation:

Existing Mitigation Measures 4.9.2A, 4.9.2B, 4.9.2C, and 4.9.2D, described above, are also applicable to cumulative impacts. Implementation of these mitigation measures

1 would reduce cumulative impacts regarding housing within flood hazard areas to a
2 less than significant level.

3 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-115 through 5-117

4 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.11.B) Cause Impediment of Flows

5 Future development accommodated will contribute incrementally to cumulative
6 flooding and inundation impacts as Riverside County builds out over time pursuant to
7 the Riverside County General Plan (regardless of scenario). Placement of structures
8 within 100-year flood hazard areas to accommodate future growth can incrementally
9 contribute to the impediment or redirection of flood flows. This could expose existing
10 people, structures and property, as well as those introduced by new development, to
11 increased flooding risks. However, with the regulatory and mitigation measures
12 previously described under the "Project Impacts" section of this document,
13 cumulative impacts would be avoided, reduced or minimized to non-substantial
14 levels.

15 Cumulative Mitigation:

16 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.9.1A, 4.9.1B, 4.9.1C, and 4.9.1D, described in the
17 project impacts section above, are also applicable to cumulative impacts.
18 Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce cumulative impacts
19 regarding impediment of flows to a less than significant level.

20 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-115 through 5-117

21 3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.11.E) Cause Inundation Risk Due to Seiche, Tsunami or
22 Mudflow

23 Future development accommodated will contribute incrementally to cumulative
24 flooding and inundation impacts as Riverside County builds out over time pursuant to
25 the Riverside County General Plan (regardless of scenario). Future development in
26 areas subject to seiche has the potential to threaten people, structures and property.
27 There is no documented significant potential for seiche in any of the waterbodies
28 within Riverside County. Based on morphology and hydrology, however, two

1 waterbodies in Riverside County (Lake Perris and Lake Elsinore) may have the
2 potential for seismically induced seiche. Thus, future development downstream from
3 or within the seiche flooding zones of these waterbodies may cumulatively increase
4 the number of people and property potentially at risk. However, setbacks and flood
5 hazard area regulations are expected to be sufficient protection against significant
6 risks, and thus, future development along or near lakes and reservoirs is considered to
7 be at minimal risk.

8 Due to its inland location, by definition there are no tsunami risks, cumulative or
9 otherwise, in Riverside County.

10 Mudflow or debris flow can occur in areas with steep slopes, particularly areas with
11 loose soils and/or denuded of vegetation (e.g., fire burn areas) when exposed to large
12 amounts of precipitation, and narrow canyons, arroyos and desert channels are also
13 susceptible to flashfloods which can cause flooding damage directly or indirectly
14 through mudflows. Growth within Riverside County will incrementally increase the
15 people and property potentially at risk for mudslide. However, when addressed
16 through the required soil engineering, site design and maintenance, these risks can be
17 maintained at less than significant.

18 Therefore, cumulative impacts regarding inundation risks due to seiche, tsunami or
19 mudflow would be avoided, reduced or minimized to non-substantial levels. Project
20 design, soils engineering and construction requirements, including NPDES, CWA
21 section 404, Riverside County ordinances and others would be sufficient to ensure
22 that cumulative impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required. Refer
23 to the "Project Impacts" section of the document for a full discussion of the
24 regulations, policies, and mitigation measures that would reduce cumulative impacts
25 to a less than significant level.

26 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-116 through 5-117

27 ///

28 ///

1 F. Geology and Soils

2 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.12.A) Expose People or Structures to Substantial Adverse
3 Effects Due to Rupture of a Known Earthquake Faults

4 Future development as the General Plan builds out (per any of the scenarios) will
5 increase the potential for property loss, injury or death resulting from development
6 where it occurs on or adjacent to known or as of yet undetected earthquake fault
7 zones. This will incrementally expose people and structures to adverse effects due to
8 rupture of a known earthquake fault. This risk, however, will be mitigated through
9 compliance with various regulatory measures, including the prohibition on building on
10 or adjacent to active faults, and cumulative impacts would be reduced to less than
11 significant. Refer to the "Project Impacts" section of this document for a full
12 discussion the regulations, policies, and mitigation measures that would reduce
13 cumulative impacts to a less than significant level. Cumulative Mitigation:

14 Implementation of Existing Mitigation Measure 4.10.1A, discussed above, is applicable
15 to cumulative impacts as well. This mitigation measure would be sufficient to ensure
16 that incremental (non-substantial) cumulative impacts regarding exposing people or
17 structures to adverse effects due to rupture of a known earthquake fault are reduced
18 to a less than significant level.

19 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-124 through 5-126

20 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.12.C) Expose People or Structures to Substantial Adverse
21 Effects Due to Seismic Related Ground Failure, Including Liquefaction

22 Portions of unincorporated Riverside County are susceptible to liquefaction, a
23 destructive secondary effect of strong seismic shaking. This will incrementally expose
24 people and structures to adverse effects due to seismic-related ground failure,
25 including liquefaction. This risk, however, will be mitigated through compliance with
26 various regulatory measures and mitigation measures, described above in "Project
27 Impacts," and cumulative impacts would be reduced to less than significant.
28

1 Cumulative Mitigation:

2 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.10.3A and 4.10.3B, discussed above, are applicable to
3 cumulative impacts as well. These mitigation measures would be sufficient to ensure
4 that incremental (non-substantial) cumulative impacts regarding seismic-related
5 ground failure, including liquefaction, are reduced to a less than significant level.

6 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-124 through 5-126

7 3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.12.E) Result in Substantial Soil Erosion or Topsoil Loss

8 Areas potentially subject to soil erosion or topsoil loss will be incrementally exposed
9 during future development activities as the General Plan (any scenario) builds out.
10 Wind and water are the two biggest factors causing soil erosion, particularly where
11 human activities have removed vegetation or otherwise disturbed the underlying soil.
12 However, compliance with the existing laws, General Plan policies and existing
13 mitigation measures described above in "Project Impacts" would help reduce
14 potential soil erosion impacts and ensure that future cumulative development would
15 have a less than significant impact on soils.

16 Cumulative Mitigation:

17 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.10.9A, 4.10.9B, 4.10.9C, and 4.10.8A, discussed above,
18 are applicable to cumulative impacts as well. These mitigation measures would be
19 sufficient to ensure that incremental (non-substantial) cumulative impacts regarding
20 soil erosion are reduced to a less than significant level.

21 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-124 through 5-127

22 4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.12.G) Result in Development on Expansive Soils

23 Expansive soils are widely distributed throughout Riverside County. Thus, any future
24 development may incrementally increase the potential for the placement of
25 structures and facilities in areas susceptible to damage resulting from expansive soils.
26 However, compliance with the existing laws, General Plan policies, and existing
27 mitigation measures described above in "Project Impacts" would help reduce
28

1 potential expansive soil impacts and ensure that future cumulative development
2 would have a less than significant impact.

3 Cumulative Mitigation:

4 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.10.7A, discussed above, is also applicable to cumulative
5 impacts regarding expansive soils. This mitigation measure would be sufficient to
6 ensure that incremental (non-substantial) cumulative impacts regarding expansive
7 soils are reduced to a less than significant level.

8 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-124 through 5-127

9 G. Noise

10 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.15.B) *Generate or Cause Exposure to Excessive*
11 *Groundborne Vibration*

12 Future development (of any of the General Plan buildout scenarios, including the
13 with-Project scenario) will require construction activities that will cause incremental
14 increases in temporary, short-term vibrations. These vibrations would be disruptive if
15 located near sensitive receptors and will result in various levels of temporary
16 groundborne vibration. Construction vibration can affect existing buildings (i.e.,
17 through structural damage) and their occupants (i.e., through activity disruption,
18 annoyance, etc.) if they are located close enough to the construction sites. However,
19 the temporary nature of the construction activities means that the disturbance would
20 be of limited duration and, for this reason, would not be cumulatively significant.

21 Future development near major rail lines or truck routes would also introduce new
22 sensitive receptors into areas affected by existing groundborne vibration,
23 incrementally increasing the people and properties exposed. In general, the potential
24 for vibration-induced structural damage from such sources would be low, but
25 disruptions or annoyance to occupants could occur if the uses were close enough to
26 such sources. However, such vibration-induced disruption/annoyance can be avoided
27 by not approving vibration-sensitive uses in areas where FTA vibration criteria (shown
28 in Table 4.15-I in Section 4.15, "Noise" in EIR No. 521, for example) are exceeded and

1 requiring setbacks of sufficient distance to ensure vibration levels are within
2 acceptable limits. Thus, compliance with regulations, as well as existing mitigation
3 measures would ensure that operational vibration effects on new development are
4 not cumulatively considerable. Refer to the "Project Impacts" section of this
5 document for a discussion of the regulations and mitigation measures that would
6 lessen cumulative impacts related to vibration to a less than significant level.

7 Cumulative Mitigation:

8 Compliance with existing Riverside County ordinances and General Plan policies
9 provided on page 4.15-167 in Section 4.15, "Noise" of EIR No. 521, as well as New
10 Mitigation Measure 4.15.B-N1, described above, would also be applicable to
11 cumulative impacts, and would be sufficient to reduce incremental impacts to a non-
12 substantial level.

13 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 4.15-167 to 4.15-168 and 5-144 through 5-147

14 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.15.E) *Expose People to Excessive Airport-Related Noise*
15 Levels

16 Future development resulting from buildout of any of the General Plan scenarios may
17 result in incremental increases in new noise-sensitive land uses that would be
18 exposed to noise from operations at public and private airports, airstrips and helipads.
19 Around larger public airports, noise levels can exceed acceptable standards in certain
20 areas, as shown by noise-contour maps of existing, future and ultimate buildout
21 operational conditions for public airports. Compliance with ALUC, Riverside County
22 and other applicable standards, as well as existing mitigation measures described
23 below, would ensure that airport-related noise impacts on future development are
24 not cumulatively considerable. Refer to the "Project Impacts" section of this
25 document for a full discussion of the applicable regulations, policies, and mitigation
26 measures that would reduce airport-related noise levels to a less than significant
27 level.
28

1 Cumulative Mitigation:

2 All future development proposed would be required to comply with applicable ALUC
3 policies, as well as state and county regulations and policies, regarding site design and
4 building construction to achieve acceptable interior and exterior noise exposure levels
5 for habitable structures. In addition, Existing Mitigation Measures 4.13.2A, 4.13.2B,
6 4.13.2C, and 4.13.2D, described above, would ensure that cumulative airport-related
7 noise impacts on future development would be reduced to less than significant.

8 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-144 through 5-147

9 H. Public Facilities

10 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.17.C-2) Cause Inconsistencies With Applicable Statutes
11 and Regulations Related to Solid Waste, Including the County Integrated Waste
12 Management Plan

13 The increase in disposal need may hasten existing landfills in reaching their permitted
14 capacity, decreasing their expected lifespan. This incremental contribution of growth,
15 as projected for the proposed Project or any of the other General Plan cumulative
16 buildout scenarios, will result in incremental, but non-substantial, cumulative impacts
17 to existing landfills. Continued long-range planning by the Riverside County Waste
18 Management Department will ensure that new disposal facilities (landfills) are
19 developed to meet increasing needs and, in particular, to accommodate the loss of
20 existing landfills as they reach permitted capacity and lifespan. The construction of
21 additional landfills will result in additional incremental environmental impacts in their
22 own right that would be addressed through both existing mitigation from both EIR No.
23 441 and EIR No. 521) and additional mitigation as deemed necessary based on future
24 project-specific analyses.

25 All future development will be required to comply with all applicable state, federal
26 and county requirements for solid waste disposal, including the Countywide
27 Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). Refer to the "Project Impacts" section
28 of this document for a full discussion of the relative regulations, policies, and

mitigation measures that would lessen the Project's cumulative impacts to solid waste disposal to a less than significant level. Accordingly, such development should not interfere with the implementation, attainment or compliance with any of these statutes or regulations. Nor will it cause inconsistencies with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste, including the CIWMP. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Mitigation:

Existing Mitigation Measures 4.15.3A through 4.15.3F, discussed in Impact 4.17.C(1), above, are also applicable to cumulative impacts regarding solid waste statutes and regulations. This measure would be sufficient to reduce incremental cumulative impacts regarding solid waste statutes and regulations to a less than significant level.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-162 and 5-164 through 5-166

I. Water Resources

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.19.C) Substantially Degrade Water Quality

Future development per buildout of any of the General Plan scenarios will incrementally increase water demands, thus increasing reliance on lower-quality water either from the Colorado River or marginal groundwater sources. It would also contribute to increased levels of pollutants in local/regional groundwater reserves and local/regional surface waters. These conditions would contribute incrementally to the deterioration of drinking water quality in Riverside County. However, as all potable water must meet the state's minimum standards of purity for water quality, adherence to such standards would ensure that cumulative impacts are not significant.

Future development will incrementally increase Riverside County's population, increasing the amount of wastewater generated, increasing the need for effluent disposal. When discharged into a stream or other surface water, effluents can degrade water quality. Additionally, stormwater runoff from urban areas contains a variety of organic and inorganic substances that would also reduce the quality of

1 groundwater when introduced into their aquifers. Adherence to strict state water
2 quality standards would ensure such impacts are not cumulatively considerable. Refer
3 to the "Project Impacts" section of this document for a full discussion of the
4 regulations, policies, and mitigation measures that would contribute to ensuring the
5 Project's cumulative impacts to water quality are less than significant.

6 Cumulative Mitigation:

7 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.5A, 4.17.5B, 4.17.5C, 4.17.5D and 4.17.5E,
8 described above, are also applicable to cumulative water quality impacts, would also
9 aid in reducing cumulative impacts to water quality to a less than significant level.
10 Refer to the full text of these measures in "4.19.C Mitigation" above.

11 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-190 through 5-193 and 5-196 through 5-197

12 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.19.D) Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge
13 Requirements

14 Future development will result in incremental changes to existing hydrology,
15 increased impervious surfaces and increased urban runoff. Such changes would
16 increase the discharge of pollutants into receiving waters, if not properly managed
17 and controlled. Compliance with the State's extensive water quality regulations,
18 including MS4 permits (for municipal separate storm sewer systems) and the NPDES
19 program of the federal Clean Water Act, would ensure that no significant violations of
20 water quality standards or waste discharge requirements occur individually or
21 cumulatively. Refer to the "Project Impacts" section of this document for a full
22 discussion of the regulations, policies, and mitigation measures that would contribute
23 to ensuring the Project's cumulative impacts to water quality standards and waste
24 discharge requirements are less than significant.

25 Cumulative Mitigation:

26 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.5A, 4.17.5B, 4.17.5C, 4.17.5D and 4.17.5E,
27 described above, are also applicable to cumulative impacts specific to water quality
28 standards and waste discharge requirements, and would also aid in reducing

1 cumulative impacts to a less than significant level. Refer to the full text of these
2 measures in the "Mitigation" discussion under Impact 4.19.C, above.

3 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-191 to 5-197

4 3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.19.E) Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements

5 Future development pursuant to any of the General Plan buildout scenarios will
6 incrementally increase the amount of wastewater (sewage) generated in the County.
7 All such wastewater must be disposed of pursuant to a variety of state and federal
8 water quality laws (see list on page 5-192 and page 5-193). Accordingly, compliance
9 with extensive regulations would ensure that future development does not
10 individually or cumulatively exceed any wastewater treatment requirements. Similar
11 compliance requirements that strictly regulate the construction and maintenance of
12 septic tanks will ensure that incremental increases in use of septic systems do not
13 result in cumulative exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements. Refer to the
14 "Project Impacts" section of this document for a full discussion of the regulations,
15 policies, and mitigation measures that would contribute to ensuring the Project's
16 cumulative impacts related to exceeding wastewater treatment requirements are less
17 than significant.

18 Cumulative Mitigation:

19 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.15.4A, 4.17.5A, 4.17.5E, and 4.10.9A, and New
20 Mitigation Measure 4.19.E-N1, described above, are also applicable to cumulative
21 wastewater treatment requirement impacts, would also aid in reducing cumulative
22 impacts to a less than significant level. Refer to the full text of these measures in
23 Impact 4.19.E "Mitigation" above.

24 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-191 through 5-193 and 5-194 through 5-197

25 4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.19.F) Exceed Wastewater Treatment Capacity

26 Future development will incrementally increase wastewater generation, increasing
27 the need for its treatment and potentially exceeding the capacities of existing
28 treatment facilities, necessitating the construction of additional facilities. In addition,

1 where sanitary sewer connection and treatment are not available, septic systems
2 would be necessary. The proliferation of septic systems in rural communities may
3 potentially contaminate groundwater with nitrates, ammonia, salts, metals, organic
4 solvents, grease and oil, and other substances, impairing the beneficial uses of local
5 water supplies. However, compliance with existing laws, regulatory programs,
6 ordinances, General Plan policies and existing mitigation measures from EIR No. 441
7 would be sufficient to ensure that cumulative impacts associated with wastewater
8 treatment capacities are less than significant. Refer to the "Project Impacts" section of
9 this document for a full discussion of the regulations, policies, and mitigation
10 measures that would contribute to ensuring the Project's cumulative impacts related
11 to exceeding wastewater treatment capacity are less than significant.

12 Cumulative Mitigation:

13 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.5D (listed under Impact 4.19.D, above), 4.15.4A and
14 4.10.9A (Impact 4.19.E, above), 4.9.1C (Impact 4.19.H, below) and 4.17.5E (Impact
15 4.19.I) are also applicable to cumulative impacts, and would also aid in reducing
16 cumulative impacts associated with wastewater treatment facilities to less than
17 significant.

18 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-191 through 5-193 and 5-194 through 5-197

19 5. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.19.G) Result in Significant Adverse Effects Due to the
20 Construction of New or Expanded Water or Wastewater Facilities

21 Future development would incrementally increase demand for water supply,
22 wastewater treatment and infrastructure to supply these services. These increases
23 would contribute incrementally to the need for new or expanded water and
24 wastewater treatment facilities. Since future development would be implemented on
25 a case-by-case basis across many individual sites spread across the County over
26 roughly 50 years, however, it would not result in significant impacts tied to specific,
27 inalterable areas. Rather, the future locations of such facilities can be established
28 (located) so as to minimize potential environmental effects. Thus, cumulative impacts

1 due to the need for new or expanded water and wastewater facilities would not be
2 significant. Refer to the "Project Impacts" section of this document for a full
3 discussion of the regulations, policies, and mitigation measures that would contribute
4 to ensuring the Project's cumulative impacts due to the need for new or expanded
5 water or wastewater facilities are less than significant.

6 Cumulative Mitigation:

7 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.1C and 4.17.1D, described above, and Mitigation
8 Measure 4.17.5A, described under Impact 4.19.E, above, are also applicable to
9 cumulative impacts, and would also aid in reducing cumulative impacts associated
10 with the need for new or expanded water and wastewater facilities to less than
11 significant.

12 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-191 through 5-193 and 5-195 through 5-197

13 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental impacts
14 associated with the Riverside County General Plan Update cannot be fully mitigated and will be only
15 partially avoided or lessened in consideration of existing regulations or mitigation measures hereinafter
16 specified in **Attachment A (Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program)**. Accordingly, and as further
17 explained below, the County makes the following findings as to each of the following impacts as allowed
18 by State CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a): "Changes or alterations [that might further reduce Project
19 impacts] are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the [County].
20 Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other
21 agency"; or "Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision
22 of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or
23 project alternatives identified in the final EIR." Therefore, a statement of overriding considerations
24 consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, 15126(b), and 15126.2(b) and discussed in the Final EIR
25 Section 1.6 is required and included herein:

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 A. Population and Housing

2 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.3.A) Induce Direct or Indirect Population Growth

3 The analysis provided in Section 5.5, "Cumulative Impacts" in EIR No. 521 (pages 5-59
4 through 5-63) indicates that future development consistent with any of the General
5 Plan buildout analyzed, including the proposed Project (GPA No. 960), would
6 contribute mostly non-substantially to incremental impacts related to population and
7 housing issues. However, even with avoidance and minimization measures discussed
8 on page 5-63 of Section 5.5, the Project would contribute substantially to significant
9 cumulative impacts stemming from the inducement of substantial population growth
10 directly and indirectly. Buildout of the cumulative General Plan scenario would do
11 likewise. Due to the inherently growth-inducing and growth-accommodating nature of
12 a General Plan, there is no feasible mitigation to fully reduce these cumulative
13 impacts to below the level of significance. There are several existing General Plan
14 policies and mitigation measures that would aid in reducing significant impact
15 associated with population growth (refer to the "Project Impacts" section of this
16 document). However, even though Project effects would be individually limited, GPA
17 No. 960's incremental contribution to cumulative housing and population impacts
18 would be significant and unavoidable. Buildout of the cumulative General Plan
19 scenario would also result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to
20 population and housing within Riverside County.

21 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-59 through 5-63

22 B. Aesthetics and Visual Resources

23 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.4.A) Adversely Affect Scenic Vistas

24 In addition to infill, future development would result in the physical conversion of
25 open space, vacant and agricultural lands to more urban types of uses, incrementally
26 affecting scenic vistas and leading to cumulatively substantial impacts to these
27 resources. The extension of roadways and infrastructure into previously undeveloped
28 areas, particularly in undisturbed wildlands, would add incrementally to visual

1 impacts. Long, linear improvements, such as roads and powerlines, can be particularly
2 noticeable in open vistas. Where located in, or immediately adjacent to, large
3 expanses of scenic open space, future development would have major visible
4 aesthetic effects, particularly for sites with limited or no existing access ways that
5 would require road construction, leading to cumulatively considerable impacts.

6 The existing laws, County regulatory programs, General Plan policies and existing
7 mitigation measures from EIR No. 441 previously described in the "Project Impacts"
8 section of his document help reduce potential impacts to scenic resources. However,
9 even with existing and additional Project-specific mitigation, regulatory programs, and
10 policies, the cumulative impacts associated with buildout of any of the General Plan
11 scenarios would be significant and unavoidable.

12 Cumulative Mitigation:

13 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.4.1A states "Development projects shall be subject to
14 the requirements of all relevant guidelines, including the community center
15 guidelines, Riverside County supervisorial district guidelines and all applicable
16 standards, policies and/ or regulations of the County of Riverside or other affected
17 entities pertaining to scenic vistas and aesthetic resources. Factors considered in
18 these guidelines include the scale, extent, height, bulk or intensity of development;
19 the location of development; the type, style and intensity of adjacent land uses; the
20 manner and method of construction, including materials, coatings and landscaping;
21 the interim and/or final use of the development; the type, location and manner of
22 illumination and signage; the nature and extent of terrain modification required; and
23 the potential effects to the established visual characteristic of the project site and
24 identified scenic vista or aesthetic resource."

25 New Mitigation Measure 4.4.A-N1 states "No development shall be approved for
26 parcels without adequate legal access and adequate physical access. Adequate and
27 accessible circulation facilities must also exist to meet the demand of the proposed
28 land use."

1 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-67 through 5-69

2 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.4.B) Adversely Affect Scenic Resources Within State Scenic
3 Highways

4 Within proximity to State-designated scenic highways, interface/wildland areas would
5 see the greatest increase in development potential (roughly 10,000 acres);
6 rural/agricultural areas would also see a roughly three-fold increase as well. The
7 amount of land devoted to public facilities would decrease slightly, but the increased
8 development would occur mainly at the expense of available vacant and open space
9 lands. Since much more land is in proximity to State-eligible and County-eligible scenic
10 highways, this pattern of development potential increasing in urban/suburban and
11 rural/agricultural areas at the expense of vacant and open space lands is even more
12 pronounced. In particular, development potential within interface/wildland areas
13 greatly increases under the existing General Plan. Proposed changes from both the
14 Project and for the cumulative scenario slightly lessen these increases, but the overall
15 impact on scenic resources is still significant. More detailed discussion of these
16 cumulative impacts is provided on pages 5-66 and 5-67 on Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521.
17 Development would incrementally damage scenic resources, including, but not
18 limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and historical buildings within a State scenic
19 highway. Where located along a designated or eligible scenic highway, scenic vista or
20 other scenic resource, these incremental impacts could substantially impair the
21 aesthetics of the resource. Even with the abovementioned existing State and County
22 regulatory programs, General Plan policies and existing Mitigation Measures from EIR
23 No. 441, the cumulative impacts associated with buildout of any of the General Plan
24 scenarios would be significant and unavoidable (refer to the "Project Impacts" section
25 of this document for a description of these programs, policies, and mitigation
26 measures).

27 ///

28 ///

1 Cumulative Mitigation:

2 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.4.1A from EIR No. 441, discussed in Impact 4.4.A above,
3 is also applicable to this impact. Implementation of this Mitigation Measure would not
4 be sufficient to reduce this cumulative impact to a less than significant level.

5 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-66 through 5-69

6 3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.4.D) Cause Adverse Light and Glare Effects

7 Future development would create new sources of light and glare that would adversely
8 affect day or nighttime views in the areas. Lighting associated with higher intensity
9 and density uses will increase nighttime light levels and daylight glare effects on
10 sensitive areas, such as residences and natural habitat areas. Even with the
11 abovementioned variety of existing federal, State, and County regulatory programs,
12 including the General Plan policies and existing measures from EIR No. 441 (refer to
13 the "Project Impacts" section of this document), the cumulative impacts associated
14 with buildout of any of the General Plan scenarios would be significant and
15 unavoidable.

16 Cumulative Mitigation:

17 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.4.2A states, "Riverside County shall require that sources
18 of lighting within the General Plan area be limited to the minimum standard required
19 to ensure safe circulation and visibility.

20 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.4.2B states, "Riverside County shall require street
21 lighting to be limited to intersections and other locations that are needed to maintain
22 safe access (e.g., sharp curves)."

23 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.4.2C states, "Riverside County shall require exterior
24 lighting for buildings to be of a low profile and intensity."

25 Implementation of these Mitigation Measures would not be sufficient to reduce this
26 cumulative light and glare impact to a less than significant level.

27 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-67 through 5-69

1 C. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

2 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.5.A) Cause the Conversion of Designated Farmlands

3 Table 5.5-H, "Cumulative Farmland Effects", on pages 5-71 and 5-72 in Section 5.5 of
4 EIR No. 521, shows the cumulative conditions for impacts to farmlands for the
5 General Plan buildout scenarios examined in Section 5.5 of the EIR. Cumulative
6 effects of General Plan buildout were compared to the farmland mapping data from
7 the State Department of Conservation and several trends were noted. The amount of
8 Prime Farmland lost to urban/suburban development would increase nearly 250%
9 under the existing General Plan. For both the Project and cumulative General Plan
10 buildout scenarios, Prime Farmlands lost to urban/suburban development would
11 increase by roughly 12% and 20%, respectively. Both these losses are cumulatively
12 considerable. Rural/agricultural lands designated as Prime Farmland would also be
13 lost as the County develops over time, though in incrementally insignificant amounts.
14 However, compared to the existing General Plan, both the project and cumulative
15 General Plan scenarios would affect slightly (1-2%) less Prime Farmland. The amount
16 of vacant/open land would decrease roughly 80% under the existing General Plan, but
17 either the Project or cumulative scenarios would lessen these losses by roughly 10%.
18 The other types of designated farmlands show similar trends. These development
19 trends would have similar incremental effects on existing agricultural preserves and
20 result in incremental land use conflicts between agricultural and non-agricultural
21 uses. Despite the inclusion of all feasible and reasonable mitigation, the applicable
22 Riverside County regulations and policies identified in the "Project Impacts" section of
23 this document would not reduce the significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts
24 associated with the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses.

25 Cumulative Mitigation:

26 As discussed in the Mitigation discussion above, EIR No. 441 finds that policies
27 regarding agricultural lands do not set specific requirements that would limit the
28 conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses, nor do the policies identify

1 the amount, extent or location of agricultural land to be conserved. Therefore, it is
2 impossible to assess if policies would effectively reduce potentially significant impacts
3 associated with the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses. Due to
4 the inherently growth-inducing and growth-accommodating nature of a General Plan,
5 there is no feasible mitigation to fully reduce these cumulative impacts to below the
6 level of significance. Thus, even where impacts from future implementing project
7 effects would be individually limited, GPA No. 960's incremental contribution to
8 cumulative agricultural impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

9 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-70 through 5-72

10 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.5.B) *Encroach On or Conflict With Existing Agricultural*
11 *Uses*

12 Indirectly, the growth accommodated and facilitated by the Project and cumulative
13 General Plan buildout would result in additional development and infrastructure
14 demand that would further conversion of designated Farmlands to urban uses and
15 result in other changes in the existing environment leading to additional Farmland
16 conversion. Despite mitigation, the applicable Riverside County regulations and
17 policies described in the "Project Impacts" section of this document would not fully
18 reduce the significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts associated with
19 development impacts on agricultural activities, and as such, a significant and
20 unavoidable impact would occur.

21 Cumulative Mitigation:

22 As discussed in the mitigation section of the "Project Impacts" section of the
23 document, there are no feasible mitigation measures for the Project or cumulative
24 General Plan Buildout with regard to existing agricultural uses, because development
25 resulting from the Project not foreseeable at this time. Even where impacts from

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

future implementing project effects would be individually limited, GPA No. 960's incremental contribution to cumulative agricultural impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-72 to 5-73

D. Air Quality

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.6.A) Cause Inconsistency With Air Quality Plans

Relative to the 2008 SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCP), the existing (2009) General Plan would be consistent because it predates the projections used in the RCP and the RCP includes this county buildout scenario in its forecasts. For the Project scenario (buildout of the General Plan as amended by GPA No. 960), the buildout capacity, populations and overall densities are reduced compared to that of the current General Plan. However, when gaged against the existing conditions, buildout of the General Plan with the Project would result in a cumulatively considerable impact. The same holds for the cumulative buildout scenario. The cumulative scenario represents increases in capacity, density, land uses and populations that greatly exceed that of the current General Plan. As such, its incremental contributions would result in cumulatively considerable conflicts with the regional air quality plans.

Incremental contributions of future development, including that accommodated by GPA No. 960, would result in cumulatively considerable impacts due to associated violations of air quality standards or thresholds, both locally and regionally. Even where individual future development projects were successfully mitigated to less than significant levels, they would still contribute incrementally to cumulatively significant air quality impacts. Further, the abovementioned applicable Riverside County regulations and policies described in the "Project Impacts" section of this document would not fully reduce the significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts associated with air quality plan compliance, despite the mitigation described below. Because there is no feasible mechanism for the County of Riverside to control individual

1 projects with respect to their incremental pollutant contributions, impacts to air
2 quality would remain significant and unavoidable.

3 Cumulative Mitigation:

4 Refer also to the "Project Impacts" section of the document, above, for a full
5 discussion of these measures.

6 New Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N1 states, "In order to ensure GHG emissions resulting
7 from new development are reduced to levels necessary to meet California State
8 targets, the County of Riverside shall require all new discretionary development to
9 comply with the Implementation Measures of the Riverside County Climate Action
10 Plan or provide comparable custom measure backed by a project GHG study (for
11 example, using CalEEMod modeling) demonstrating achievement of the same target.
12 The target to be met is a GHG emissions reduction of 25% below emissions for the
13 adjusted "business as usual" (BAU) scenario for residential, commercial, industrial,
14 institutional and mixed-use projects. The adjusted BAU is based upon the 2020 BAU
15 found in the Final Supplement to the AB 32 Scoping Plan (CARB 2011)."

16 New Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N2 states, "In lieu of a project-specific GHG analysis
17 per Mitigation Measures 4.7.A-N1, a future discretionary project pursuant to the
18 Riverside County General Plan shall incorporate into the project design, operational
19 features and/or Implementing Measures from the County Climate Action Plan (CAP),
20 in such a manner as to garnish at least 100 points. The point values within the CAP's
21 Screening Tables constitute GHG emission reductions."

22 New Mitigation Measure 4.7A-N3 states "The County of Riverside will monitor
23 implementation of the reduction measures and revise or amend the Climate Action
24 Plan as needed based upon the results of monitoring to ensure achievement of the
25 2020 Reduction Target. In addition, the County of Riverside will start update process
26 of the Climate Action Plan in 2017 to provide a post-2020 plan. The post-2020
27 Climate Action Plan update will include a specific target for GHG reductions for 2035
28 and 2050. The targets will be consistent with broader state and federal reduction

1 targets including Executive Order S-3-05 and with the scientific understanding of the
2 needed reductions by 2050. The post-2020 Climate Action Plan update will include a
3 set of updated reduction measures to achieve the 2035 and 2050 Reduction Targets
4 and updated monitoring system to ensure that the updated targets are achieved. The
5 County of Riverside will adopt the new post-2020 Climate Action Plan update by
6 January 1, 2020.”

7 With implementation of and compliance with the regulatory programs discussed in
8 EIR No. 521, Section 4.6, “Air Quality,” Riverside County ordinances, existing and
9 proposed General Plan policies, as well as proposed new Mitigation Measures 4.7.A-
10 N1 and N2 and N3, air pollutant emissions from cumulative General Plan buildout
11 would be reduced but would still exceed regulatory thresholds for the South Coast Air
12 Basin (SCAB), Salton Sea Air Basin (SSAB), and Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB).
13 Exceedance of regulatory thresholds would conflict with the implementation of the
14 applicable air quality plans. Implementation of greenhouse gas reduction measures
15 would afford additional reductions in criteria air pollutants; however, it would not
16 reduce cumulative criteria pollutant impacts to below regulatory thresholds. Thus,
17 cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with respect to regional
18 air quality plans.

19 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-79, 5-81 and 5-86 through 5-87

20 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.6.B(1)) Cause Significant Construction (Short-Term) Air
21 Emissions

22 Construction emissions are site-specific and will vary depending on the particulars of
23 the implementing project. Because construction factors can vary so widely, estimating
24 all of the construction emissions or impacts for any of the Riverside County buildout
25 scenarios is infeasible. Instead, Table 4.6-D, “*Typical Project Construction Emission*
26 *Estimates*” in Section 4.6, “Air Quality” of EIR No. 521 shows examples of the
27 construction emissions associated with various sizes of development projects. The
28 table demonstrates the construction emissions that would result from onsite grading

1 activities, transport of materials to and from the site and the actual building
2 construction, painting and paving associated with the individual developments. Most
3 notably it shows that SCAQMD and MDAQMD thresholds for PM₁₀ will be exceeded
4 when construction activities result in the disturbance of 25 or more acres at a time. In
5 addition, the construction of 150 single-family residential units or more would also
6 exceed the SCAQMD threshold for Reactive Organic Gases (ROG).

7 Because of the ease with which individual projects can exceed regulatory thresholds,
8 construction air quality impacts would likely be considered individually significant for
9 many of these future projects. Further, since the precise timing of future
10 development cannot be controlled or readily foreseen, it is possible that multiple
11 projects would undergo construction simultaneously. The result would be
12 cumulatively considerable, even if the individual projects were individually below the
13 thresholds through mitigation. Thus, for these reasons, construction air quality
14 impacts are considered cumulatively considerable for any of the General Plan buildout
15 scenarios addressed. Even where individual future development projects were
16 successfully mitigated to less than significant levels, they would still contribute
17 incrementally to cumulatively significant air quality impacts. Further, despite
18 mitigation, the abovementioned applicable Riverside County regulations and policies
19 described in the "Project Impacts" section of this document would not fully reduce
20 the significant unavoidable cumulative impacts associated with construction-related
21 pollutant emissions. Because there is no feasible mechanism for the County of
22 Riverside to control individual projects with respect to their incremental pollutant
23 contributions, impacts to air quality would remain significant and unavoidable.

24 Cumulative Mitigation:

25 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.5.1A, 4.5.1B and 4.5.1C, and New Mitigation Measures
26 4.6.B-N1, 4.6.B-N2 and 4.6.B-N3 and 4.6.B-N4, described previously under "Project
27 Impacts," would also apply to cumulative impacts associated with operational air
28 emissions. However, as mentioned above, even with implementation of these

mitigation measures, cumulative impacts would not be reduced to less than significant levels, and impacts would remain cumulatively considerable.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-75 through 5-76 and 5-82 through 5-84

3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.6.B(2)) Cause Significant Operational (Long-Term) Air Emissions

Air quality effects are most often determined on the basis of traffic patterns which reflect land use, population and employment sources. Air quality effects are also influenced by growth projections and patterns. For the Project and cumulative buildout scenarios, operational emissions were calculated using URBEMIS for stationary and mobile source emissions. Scenario-specific data for the types and amounts of land use development planned were entered into URBEMIS to determine the pollutant emissions anticipated at full buildout. This data includes the number of residential dwelling units, square footage of non-residential land uses, average daily trips, vehicle miles traveled and average trip lengths. Where Project-specific data was not available, URBEMIS defaults were used. The result of the modeling indicates estimated air quality impacts for a variety of future scenarios, including each of the General Plan buildout scenarios proposed for this cumulative analysis. For specifics on how the air quality data was modeled, see Section 4.6.4 of EIR No. 521, and the letter addendum issued by Atkins, dated July 2013 (see Appendix EIR-10).

Table 5.5-I, "Cumulative Unmitigated Operational Emissions" on pages 5-76 and 5-77 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521 shows the anticipated unmitigated emissions for the various buildout scenarios, and Table 5.5-J, "Cumulative Mitigated Operational Emissions" on pages 5-78 and 5-79 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521 shows the same results after reductions derived from proposed mitigation. Note that the buildout scenario for the existing (2009) General Plan was not modeled since it was not one of the proposed Project outcomes, and its results would only provide a plan-to-plan comparison. As indicated in Tables 5.5-I and 5.5-J, all of the buildout scenarios would result in net emissions exceeding SCAQMD and MDAQMD thresholds of significance

for CO, ROG, SOX, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, but would be less than significant for NOX emissions. The negative net emissions associated with NOX reflects the substantial decrease in anticipated emissions from vehicles resulting from state and federally mandated vehicle efficiency increases over time.

Stationary and mobile sources would emit criteria pollutants based on the level of daily operation. Modeling results indicate that such emissions would be large, both for the Project and cumulatively for any of the General Plan buildout scenarios, due to hundreds of individual sources that would be developed across Riverside County. Refer to the "Project Impacts" section of this document for a discussion of the regulations, policies, and mitigation measures that would contribute to lessening the Project's cumulative impacts to criteria pollutant emissions. Even with mitigation through regulatory compliance and CEQA-specific mitigation measures (from both this EIR and the prior EIR No. 441), operational criteria pollutant emissions would still cumulatively exceed regulatory thresholds. Thus, this impact would be cumulatively considerable.

Cumulative Mitigation:

Additional Project-specific Mitigation Measures 4.7.A-N1 and N2 and N3, and 4.6.B-N4 and N5, described previously under the "Project Impacts" section of this document, are also applicable cumulative operational air emissions. However, as mentioned above, even with implementation of these mitigation measures, cumulative impacts would not be reduced to less than significant levels, and cumulative operational air emission impacts would remain cumulatively considerable.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-76 through 5-77, 5-80

4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.6.C) Cause Cumulatively Significant Project Air Quality Impacts

Future development accommodated by the Project would result in the emission of criteria pollutants for which the Project is in non-attainment during both construction and operation of the new development. However, the exact location and level of

activity for development projects under proposed GPA No. 960 is unknown and therefore cumulatively considerable increases to criteria pollutant levels cannot be quantified. Even with compliance with the existing regulations and policies and the implementation of existing and new mitigation measures described above in the "Project Impacts" section of this document, the proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts.

Cumulative Mitigation:

In EIR No. 441, prepared for the 2003 RCIP General Plan, Mitigation Measures 4.5.1A, 4.5.1B and 4.5.1C were imposed to reduce impacts to air quality. These measures remain applicable to this Project and would lessen impacts to air quality by minimizing fugitive dust during construction and reducing pollution resulting from construction equipment. The measures read as follows:

Existing Mitigation Measure 4.5.1A states, "Applicable SCAQMD Rule 403 Measures: Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).

- Water active sites at least twice daily. (Locations where grading is to occur will be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving.)
- All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered, or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).
- Pave construction access roads at least 100 feet onto the site from main road.
- Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.

Existing Mitigation Measure 4.5.1B provides additional SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook dust measures:

- Re-vegetate disturbed areas as quickly as possible.☐
- All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.

- All streets shall be swept once a day if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water).
- Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.

Existing Mitigation Measure 4.5.1C provides additional mitigation measures for construction equipment and vehicles exhaust emissions:

- The construction contractor shall select the construction equipment used on site based on low emission factors and high energy efficiency.
- The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.
- The construction contractor shall utilize electric- or diesel-powered equipment, in lieu of gasoline-powered engines, where feasible.
- The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period will be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time.
- The construction contractor shall time the construction activities so as to not interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flagperson shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.
- The construction contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew.
- Dust generated by the development activities shall be retained on-site and kept to a minimum by following the dust control measures listed below.

- During clearing, grading, earthmoving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease.
- During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the late morning, after work is completed for the day and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour.
- Immediately after clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.
- Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.
- Trucks transporting soil, sand, cut or fill materials and/or construction debris to or from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin."

Where future development accommodated by GPA No. 960 would exceed regulatory thresholds for construction emissions, new Mitigation Measures 4.6.B-N1, 4.6B-N2 and 4.6.B-N3, as listed under Impact 4.6.B(1) above, would be implemented to further reduce construction emissions. In addition, new Mitigation Measures 4.7.A-N1 and 4.7.A-N2, as listed under Impact 4.7.A above, as well as 4.6.B-N4 and 4.6.B-N5, as listed under Impact 4.6.B above, would also be implemented for future development to further reduce criteria pollutant emissions from operational activities. Because these mitigation measures reduce emissions associated with all future development projects within the unincorporated Riverside County area, the mitigation measures will also reduce the cumulative air quality impacts associated with all future

development projects within the unincorporated Riverside County area, but not to a level of less than significant.

For the reasons presented above, implementation and compliance with the above-listed existing Mitigation Measures 4.5.1A, 4.5.1B and 4.5.1C from EIR No. 441, as well as new Mitigation Measures 4.6.B-N1, 4.6.B-N2, 4.6.B-N3, 4.7.A-N1, 4.7.A-N2, 4.6.B-N4 and 4.6.B-N5 from EIR No. 521, would reduce construction and operation-related air quality impacts. However, even with these mitigation measures, future construction and operational emissions would likely exceed SCAQMD and MDAQMD thresholds. As a result, the Project would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts with respect to the emission of criteria pollutants.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-80 and 5-82 through 5-87

5. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.6.D) Expose Sensitive Receptors to Air Pollutants

Localized significance thresholds (LSTs) were developed by the SCAQMD to determine maximum allowable concentrations of criteria air pollutants during construction or operation for individual developments. Due to the programmatic nature of the General Plan and the proposed Project, detailed construction phasing, equipment and intensities are not available for the development area. Further, the exact size and location of future development within Riverside County is unknown at this time. Therefore, a countywide buildout analysis of impacts to sensitive receptors and population groups cannot be accurately determined using LST analysis and would be inappropriate under the SCAQMD's LST methodology, because specific acreages, uses and distances to sensitive receptors are required in order to calculate localized pollutant concentrations at sensitive receptors. For reference, however, the LST emissions associated with "typical" construction and operation activities are presented in Tables 4.6-I, "Localized Significant Analysis for 5-Acre Site – Construction" and 4.6-J, "Localized Significant Analysis for 5-Acre Site – Operational" of Section 4.6.5 of EIR No. 521.

1 In addition to criteria pollutant analysis, localized emissions of toxic air contaminants
2 (TACs) are also of concern with respect to sensitive receptors. Sources of TACs include
3 diesel particulate matter from railroads, emissions from the combustion of airplane
4 fuel, benzene emissions in close proximity to gasoline dispensing stations, dry
5 cleaners and film processing services that use perchloroethylene, auto body shops
6 due to various solvents, furniture manufacturers and repair facilities that use
7 methylene chloride and print shops that use various solvents. The primary source of
8 TACs within Riverside County is diesel-fueled trucks and other vehicles traveling the
9 freeways and major roadways. In 2005, CARB published the "Air Quality and Land Use
10 Handbook – A Community Health Perspective," to provide guidance on how to
11 analyze TAC emissions. The CARB Guidance recommends buffer zones to insulate
12 sensitive receptors from TAC sources.

13 Due to the programmatic nature of the various General Plan buildout scenarios, it is
14 not possible to forecast the detailed construction phasing, equipment and intensities,
15 as well as project size, timing, etc., necessary to model LSTs or TACs with any degree
16 of accuracy or reliability. It can be assumed, however, that various sizes and types of
17 projects will be developed. And because of the increased densities planned on the
18 General Plan land use maps and the stated desire for residential land uses to be
19 developed close to both transit and commercial centers (to reduce vehicle miles
20 driven in the county, to improve regional air quality), it can be assumed that both the
21 construction and the operation of commercial and industrial sources would be
22 developed relatively close to sensitive receptors, including residences, schools and
23 medical facilities. Since TACs are measured based on their localized significance
24 relative to exposure of adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors, however, a cumulative
25 level of significance cannot be assigned to such values; they are only cumulatively
26 significant in terms of localized contributions. Such localized contributions cannot be
27 calculated at the programmatic level.
28

1 Future development will expose sensitive receptors (residence, school, hospital, etc.)
2 to air pollutant emissions from both construction and operational activities. Such
3 impacts are generally localized to just the sensitive receptors surrounding the
4 emission source. On a cumulative basis, impacts to sensitive receptors could be
5 cumulatively considerable where more than one source emitter occurs in proximity to
6 a sensitive receptor. Even when the individual sources are within regulatory limits, the
7 potential exists for limits to be exceeded on a cumulative basis. This is particularly
8 true for incremental mobile source (vehicular) emissions from major freeways with
9 existing or future high traffic volumes.

10 Further, as the exact location, timing and level of future development activities arising
11 from buildout of any of the General Plan scenarios cannot be foreseen to the degree
12 of specificity necessary, specific impacts to sensitive receptors cannot be quantified.
13 Thus, even after complying with the regulations, policies, and implementing all
14 mitigation measures described above in the "Project Impacts" section of this
15 document, impacts cannot be guaranteed to be reduced to below applicable agency
16 thresholds. Thus, this impact is considered cumulatively significant and unavoidable
17 with respect to exposure of sensitive receptors for any of the General Plan buildout
18 scenarios, including that encompassing the Project.

19 Cumulative Mitigation:

20 Incremental contributions of future development, including that accommodated by
21 GPA No. 960, would result in cumulatively considerable impacts to sensitive
22 receptors, both locally and regionally. Existing Mitigation Measures 4.5.1A, 4.5.1B and
23 4.5.1C, and new Mitigation Measures 4.6.B-N1, N2 and N3, described above in the
24 "Project Impacts" section of this document, would reduce cumulative impacts to
25 sensitive receptors, but not to a less than significant level. As discussed above, even
26 where individual future development projects were successfully mitigated to less than
27 significant levels, they would still contribute incrementally to cumulatively significant
28 air quality impacts. Because there is no feasible mechanism for the County of

Riverside to control individual projects with respect to their incremental pollutant contributions, impacts to air quality would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-77 through 5-80 and 5-82 through 5-87

E. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.7.A) Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Buildout of Riverside County over time pursuant to any of the General Plan scenarios, including the Project, would result in future construction and operational activities that generate GHGs. Either individually or collectively, these activities can result in substantial emissions of GHGs; for example, exceeding the 3,000-10,000 metric tons per year (MTY) thresholds proposed by the SCAQMD in Tier 3 of its 2008 Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas Significance Thresholds. For all but the cumulative scenario, however, implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and particularly, the Implementation Measures in the proposed Climate Action Plan (CAP), plus a variety of proposed mitigation measures, would be sufficient to ensure that incremental GHG emissions in Riverside County are less than significant through at least 2020 to 2035, based on available technology and feasibility of current mitigation (refer to the discussion included in the "Project Impacts" section of this document.) There would be a marked increase in mobile source GHG emissions in both the business as usual (BAU) and reduced operational emissions conditions due to increased vehicle trips associated with the cumulative General Plan buildout, even with mitigation for years 2020 and 2035. Both scenarios (GPU and CULM) would be cumulatively considerable for GHG impacts beyond 2035 to 2060 based on present technology and mitigation feasibility. As shown in Tables 5.5-K, "*Cumulative Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions (AB 32)*" and 5.5-L, "*Cumulative Per-Capita Greenhouse Gas Emissions (SB 375)*" on page 5-90 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521, impacts would be cumulatively significant and unavoidable because the reduction target could not be met.

///

///

1 Cumulative Mitigation:

2 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.5.1C includes provisions for construction equipment
3 and vehicles exhaust emissions (refer to Mitigation Measure 4.5.1C, discussed
4 previously) that would reduce cumulative greenhouse gas emission impacts, but not
5 to a level that is less than significant.

6 New Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N1 states "In order to ensure GHG emissions resulting
7 from new development are reduced to levels necessary to meet state targets, the
8 County of Riverside shall require all new discretionary development to comply with
9 the Implementation Measures of the Riverside County Climate Action Plan or provide
10 comparable custom measures backed by a project GHG study (for example, using
11 CalEEMod modeling) demonstrating achievement of the same target. The target to be
12 met is a GHG emissions reduction of 25% below emissions for the adjusted BAU
13 scenario for residential, commercial, industrial, institutional and mixed-use projects.
14 The adjusted BAU is based upon the 2020 adjusted BAU found in the Final
15 Supplement to the AB 32 Scoping Plan (CARB 2011)."

16 New Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N2 states, "In lieu of a project-specific analysis per
17 Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N1, a future discretionary project proposed pursuant to the
18 Riverside County General Plan shall incorporate into the project design, operational
19 features and/or Implementing Measures from the County Climate Action Plan, in such
20 a manner as to garnish at least 100 points. The point values within the CAP's
21 Screening Tables constitute GHG emission reductions."

22 New Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N3 states, "The County of Riverside will monitor
23 implementation of the reduction measures and revise or amend the Climate Action
24 Plan as needed based upon the results of monitoring to ensure achievement of the
25 2020 Reduction Target. In addition, the County of Riverside will start update process
26 of the Climate Action Plan in 2017 to provide a post-2020 plan. The post-2020
27 Climate Action Plan update will include a specific target for GHG reductions for 2035
28 and 2050. The targets will be consistent with broader state and federal reduction

1 targets including Executive Order S-3-05 and with the scientific understanding of the
2 needed reductions by 2050. The post-2020 Climate Action Plan update will include a
3 set of updated reduction measures to achieve the 2035 and 2050 Reduction Targets
4 and updated monitoring system to ensure that the updated targets are achieved. The
5 County of Riverside will adopt the new post-2020 Climate Action Plan update by
6 January 1, 2020. These new mitigation measures would reduce greenhouse gas
7 emissions, but not to a level that is less than significant. Impacts would remain
8 cumulatively considerable.”

9 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-89 to 5-90 and 5-93 through 5-94

10 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.7.B) Conflict with GHG Reduction Plans, Policies or
11 Regulations

12 Implementation of the General Plan, as updated pursuant to the proposed project
13 (i.e., the GPU/GPA 960 scenario) would result in future construction and operational
14 activities that generate GHGs. This generation of GHGs would potentially conflict with
15 the implementation of AB 32 and SB 375, California policies for reducing GHG
16 emissions. However, implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and
17 particularly the Implementation Measures of the Riverside County CAP, plus proposed
18 new Mitigation Measures 4.7.A-N1 and 4.7.A-N2, would ensure that build out of the
19 General Plan, as amended by GPA No. 960, would be consistent with both Riverside
20 County’s proposed Climate Action Plan (CAP) and State of California mandates (under
21 AB 32 and SB 375), at least as applies to years 2020 and 2035, and have a less than
22 significant impact on their implementation for this interim period. Refer to the
23 “Project Impacts” section of this document for a full discussion of the regulations,
24 policies, and mitigation measures that would aid in reducing the potential significant
25 unavoidable cumulative impacts of the Project. For long-range GHG reduction targets,
26 however, both project (GPU) and CULM scenarios would result in cumulatively
27 significant impacts. In particular, GHG emissions occurring within Riverside County
28 between 2020 and 2060 would be cumulatively significant and unavoidable because

1 they would contribute to GHG levels in excess of the 2050 mitigation targets
2 established for California under Executive Order S-3-05, i.e., reducing GHG emissions
3 to "80% below 1990 levels by 2050." The County is committed toward the reduction
4 of GHG emissions. However, the means to achieve the 2050 reduction target is
5 technologically infeasible at this time. New Mitigation Measure 4.7.A-N3 requires the
6 County to provide by January 1, 2020, a post-2020 CAP that includes 2035 and 2050
7 reduction targets and specific reduction measures to achieve those targets. This
8 allows technology, the State and the County the time needed to develop reduction
9 measures able to achieve the 2050 reduction target. At present, however, there is no
10 feasible mitigation to fully reduce this cumulative impact to below the level of
11 significance in terms of 2050 targets. Thus, even though project effects may be
12 individually limited, GPA No. 960's incremental contribution to these cumulative
13 greenhouse gas impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

14 Cumulative Mitigation:

15 Refer to the Mitigation discussion in Impact 4.7.A, above. Cumulative impacts with
16 regard to conflicts with GHG reduction plans, policies or regulations would not be
17 reduced to less than significant, even with the implementation of the mitigation
18 measures discussed above.

19 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-91 and 5-93 through 5-94

20 F. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

- 21 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impacts 4.9.A: – Adversely Change the Significance of Historical
22 Resources, 4.9.B: Cause the Destruction of Known Archeological Resources, 4.9.C: Cause
23 the Destruction of Unique Paleontological Resources or Sites, 4.9.D: Result in the
24 Disturbance of Human Remains)

25 Effects to known cultural resources (historical, archeological and paleontological) can
26 be mitigated to less than significant levels through the regulatory and mitigation
27 measures outlined in Section 4.9, "Cultural and Paleontological Resources" of EIR No.
28 521, as well as in the "Project Impacts" section of this document. However, since most

1 cultural resources occur below ground (particularly paleontological resources, which
2 are heavily geology-dependent), most cultural resources remain unknown and
3 undiscovered until uncovered by ground-disturbing activity, for example site grading,
4 road construction or trenching for pipelines. As a result, the likelihood of subsurface
5 resource disturbance by future development typically cannot be fully determined in
6 advance, particularly within the scope of the countywide programmatic EIR No. 521.
7 Rather, such determinations will have to be made at the individual implementing
8 project stage and addressed (mitigated) via the mechanisms outlined in EIR No. 521,
9 Section 4.9, which presents explicit, mandatory measures that must be taken when an
10 artifact or other cultural resource is unearthed.

11 Nevertheless, since paleontological resources do correlate with geology, a generalized
12 assessment of relative paleontological sensitivity was developed for much of Riverside
13 County (i.e., see Figure 4.9.3 in Section 4.9 of EIR No. 521) and the existing and
14 proposed land uses associated with the various General Plan buildout scenarios were
15 assessed against this sensitivity to examine cumulative impacts. The results of this
16 analysis are shown in Table 5.5-N on pages 5-100 and 5-101 in Section 5.5 of EIR No.
17 521.

18 The results indicate that buildout of the existing General Plan will result in disturbance
19 of a great deal of additional land with high paleontological sensitivity (e.g., Ha or Hb).
20 In particular, acreage devoted to urban/suburban uses will roughly double and the
21 area potentially developed within the interface/wildland fringes of Riverside County
22 will increase roughly ten-fold (23,000 to nearly 234,000 acres). Lastly, the area left
23 vacant and open will decrease by roughly two-thirds.

24 For the updated General Plan (with the Project) and cumulative General Plan buildout
25 scenarios, similar trends will occur, however in much smaller amounts. The
26 incremental increases associated with the individual future projects pursuant to these
27 scenarios will be individually insignificant. However, cumulatively they will amount to
28 upwards of 3% to 8% of the total area by category. Specifically, for the Project

1 scenario, uses within high-sensitivity areas will increase roughly 1% in
2 urban/suburban areas and nearly 5% for public facility uses. Though offset by a nearly
3 8% increase in open space and nearly 6% less development within interface/wildland
4 areas, the overall cumulative effects to paleontologically sensitive lands will still be
5 considerable. Similar trends are seen for the cumulative scenario, with slightly higher
6 amounts of urban/suburban and rural/agricultural uses (5% and 1%, respectively) and
7 no offsetting increase in vacant/open space. Public facility lands also remain about
8 the same.

9 Therefore, it has been determined that: a) land disturbances from construction of
10 new development would uncover and/or adversely affect presently unknown historic
11 or archeological resources; b) future development would result directly or indirectly in
12 the destruction of unique paleontological resources, sites or unique geological
13 features, particularly previously unknown subsurface resources; and c) since
14 uncovered human remains can also be of modern origins, and hence potentially part
15 of a crime scene, specific County of Riverside regulations require contacting the
16 Riverside County Coroner's Office for initial assessment of any uncovered human
17 remains. Specifically, HSC Section 7050.5(b) states that no further disturbance shall
18 occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin.
19 Further, pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free
20 from disturbance until a final decision as to their treatment and disposition has been
21 made. If the remains are determined not to be modern, subsequent treatment of the
22 discovery is handled in coordination with the Tribe determined by the State of
23 California to be the "Most Likely Descendent." Subsequently, cumulatively
24 considerable impacts will occur as Riverside County grows pursuant to the General
25 Plan, regardless of the scenario. The removal or destruction of cultural resources and
26 the cumulative effect of their disturbance cannot be guaranteed to be reduced to less
27 than significant levels even with mitigation. This is due to the unknown nature of the
28 extent, location and cultural significance of such resources.

1 Cumulative Mitigation:

2 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.7.1B states, "Avoidance is the preferred treatment for
3 cultural resources. Where feasible, project plans shall be developed to allow
4 avoidance of cultural resources. Where avoidance of construction impacts is possible,
5 capping of the cultural resource site and avoidance planting (e.g., planting of prickly
6 pear cactus) shall be employed to ensure that indirect impacts from increased public
7 availability to the site are avoided. Where avoidance is selected, cultural resource
8 sites shall be placed within permanent conservation easements or dedicated open
9 space."

10 New Mitigation Measure 4.9.B-N1 states "If avoidance and/or preservation in place of
11 cultural resources is not feasible, the following mitigation measures shall be initiated
12 for each impacted site: a) Discoveries shall be discussed with the Native American
13 tribal (or other appropriate ethnic/ cultural group representative) and the Riverside
14 County Archeologist, and a decision shall be made with the concurrence of the
15 Planning Director, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery,
16 avoidance, etc.) appropriate for the cultural resource; and b) Further ground
17 disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has
18 been reached by all parties as to appropriate preservation or mitigation measures."

19 As discussed above, implementation of these mitigation measures would not reduce
20 cumulative impacts to a less than significant level, and impacts would remain
21 cumulatively considerable.

22 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-102 through 5-107

23 G. Energy Resources

24 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impacts 4.10.A: Increase Demand for Electricity and 4.10.B: Increase
25 Demand for Natural Gas)

26 Typically, the introduction of new development into an area brings with it an
27 attendant new demand for energy resources, including natural gas and, in particular,
28 electricity. Development may also utilize propane and other fuels. Accordingly, spatial

1 analysis was performed to examine the cumulative demands of General Plan buildout
2 on energy resources. To encapsulate the scope of impacts resulting from buildout, the
3 various General Plan buildout scenarios were analyzed for theoretical use/demand for
4 the energy resources. These energy analyses reflect the range of impacts associated
5 with the theoretical demand for energy (electricity and natural gas) for the specific
6 land uses indicated for each scenario. For specifics on methodology used, see Section
7 4.10.4 in EIR No. 521.

8 Tables 5.5-O and 5.5-P on pages 5-109 and 5-110 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521 build
9 out conditions for the three General Plan scenarios examined in Section 5.5: Existing
10 General Plan, the Updated General Plan as per GPA No. 960, and the cumulative
11 General Plan as per the additional proposed GPAs through 2009. It should be noted
12 that the baseline (existing) energy levels listed in the table are theoretical, i.e., based
13 on standardized modeling. The same modeling procedures were used to estimate
14 results for each of the buildout scenarios. By controlling these variables, valid
15 comparisons amongst the scenarios are possible.

16 These data should not be construed as the actual energy usage for a given location, a
17 specific existing use or its future development. Privacy laws protect such information
18 from being publicly released for private properties. Further, specific information is
19 typically provided by the associated utility provider when an implementing
20 development is proposed. Each utility provider has developed its own methods,
21 formulae and factors for projecting future demand, which are neither available nor
22 practicable for calculating for the programmatic EIR No. 521. In general, however,
23 where the proposed project is consistent with regional (Southern California
24 Association of Governments [SCAG]) and County growth projections, it is assumed
25 long-range planning undertaken by individual utilities and service providers would be
26 sufficient to meet future needs, since they also reference these same SCAG and
27 county projections.
28

1 The results of the energy modeling (electricity and natural gas, the only two energy
2 sources for which sufficient information was available for accurate modeling) for
3 baseline (existing) conditions and the various cumulative buildout scenarios are
4 presented in Tables 5.5-O and 5.5-P, respectively. All data represent direct energy
5 usage. Indirect energy uses, such as by water providers, are addressed separately at
6 the regional scale in Section 4.7, "*Greenhouse Gases*" of EIR No. 521. Because energy
7 use depends on the technology, generation source, service area size and a number of
8 other factors, specific indirect energy use projections are not feasible as part of the
9 programmatic EIR No. 521. See EIR No. 521 Section 4.10.4 for specifics on the
10 assumptions used in these analyses.

11 As shown in above-referenced Tables 5.5-O and 5.5-P, General Plan buildout (of any
12 scenario) will contribute incrementally to the demand for energy resources within
13 Riverside County and result in varying degrees of impacts in order to meet such
14 demand, depending on the size, scope and location of the incremental development
15 proposed. For both the with-Project scenario and the cumulative GPAs scenario,
16 General Plan buildout would result in cumulatively considerable increases in demand
17 for both electricity and natural gas to serve the additional residential units that would
18 result, even though individual increases associated with implementing projects over
19 time would be incrementally insignificant. For natural gas, the cumulative scenario
20 would also significantly increase incremental demand as a result of additional
21 commercial development.

22 In terms of increased demand for energy, in particular electricity and natural gas,
23 buildout of any of the above General Plan scenarios would result in cumulatively
24 considerable impacts to energy resources, even with implementation of the key
25 regulations, General Plan policies and mitigation measures discussed above in the
26 "Project Impacts" section of this document as well as on pages 5-110 through 5-112 in
27 Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521. Cumulatively considerable impacts regarding electricity
28 and natural gas would remain significant.

Cumulative Mitigation:

Existing Mitigation Measure 4.8.1A states, "The County [of Riverside] shall review all development proposals prior to the approval of development plans to guarantee that sufficient energy resources and facilities are available to supply adequate energy to the proposed project and associated uses."

Existing Mitigation Measure 4.8.1B states, "The County [of Riverside] shall review all development plans prior to approval to guarantee that energy conservation and efficiency standards of Title 24 are met and are incorporated into the design of the future proposed project."

As previously stated, implementation of these measures would reduce cumulative impacts but not to a less than significant level.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-108 to 5-112

H. Geology and Soils

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impacts 4.12.B: *Expose People or Structures to Substantial Strong Seismic Groundshaking* , and 4.12.D: *Expose People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Due to Landslides*)

Like all of Southern California, Riverside County has experienced and will continue to face groundshaking resulting from activity on local and regional faults. Thus, future development of any of the General Plan buildout scenarios will incrementally increase the number of people and structures at risk of injury, death or property loss due to substantial strong seismic groundshaking.

Landslides and rockfall can occur throughout Riverside County as a result of seismic activity and other natural processes, as well as resulting from human activity. Accordingly, future development of any of the General Plan buildout scenarios will incrementally increase the number of people and structures at risk of injury, death or property loss due to substantial landslide or rockfall effects.

However, even with mitigation, buildout of the cumulative General Plan would contribute substantially to significant cumulative impacts stemming from growth

1 leading to the potential exposure of additional people and structures to substantial
2 strong seismic groundshaking and also to substantial adverse effects due to landslide
3 or rockfall. Due to the inherently growth-inducing and growth-accommodating nature
4 of a General Plan, there is no feasible mitigation that will fully reduce these
5 cumulative impacts to below the level of significance, although regulations and
6 policies, as well as mitigation to address these hazards is included in the "Project
7 Impacts" section of the document above as well as on pages 5-125 through 5-128 in
8 Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521. Thus, even though Project effects would be individually
9 limited, implementation of future development would result in incremental
10 contribution to cumulative groundshaking and landslide/rockfall hazards, and
11 cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

12 Cumulative Mitigation:

13 In EIR No. 441, which was certified for the 2003 RCIP General Plan, it was determined
14 that mitigation would be necessary in order to reduce certain impacts associated with
15 seismic groundshaking, fault rupture, soil and wind erosion, and topsoil loss. These
16 mitigation measures they remain applicable to the Project and future General Plan
17 implementing projects, and include Mitigation Measures 4.10.1A, 4.10.2A, 4.10.2B,
18 4.10.2C, 4.10.3A, 4.10.3B, 4.10.7A, 4.10.8A, 4.10.9A, 4.10.9B, and 4.10.9C. Refer to
19 pages 5-125 through 5-128 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521 for the full text of these
20 measures, as well as the "Project Impacts" section of this document, above. As
21 mentioned above, these measures would not reduce cumulative impacts to a less
22 than significant level.

23 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-124 through 5-128

24 I. Hazardous Materials and Safety

25 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.13.H) Expose People or Structures to Significant Risk Due to
26 Wildland Fires

27 Future development occurring as the General Plan builds out will result in an increase
28 in the people, property and infrastructure needing fire protection and potentially at

1 risk of wildfire threat. The data in Table 5.5-U, *"Cumulative Fire Responsibility Area*
2 *Effects"* in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521 show the cumulative effects of scenario build out
3 on the various Fire Responsibility Areas within Riverside County. In addition to
4 reflecting increased uses exposed to fire hazards, the future uses indicated also reflect
5 the amount of increased demand for (and wear-and-tear on) the various fire agencies,
6 equipment and personnel providing the needed fire services. See Section 4.17.2,
7 *"Public Services - Fire Protection"* in EIR No. 521 for specifics on fire departments,
8 staffing, etc., and Section 5.5.16 in EIR No. 521 for cumulative effects on fire services.
9 Per Table 5.5-U, growth pressures within Riverside County will result in increased
10 urban, suburban and rural development. Under the existing General Plan, build out
11 will greatly increase the amount of developed uses within the State Responsibility
12 Area (SRA); from roughly 150,000 acres to over 500,000 acres. Interface/wildland
13 areas, typically at greatest risk for wildfires due to adjacent and interspersed open
14 vegetation, account for nearly 350,000 acres of this increase alone. Similar increases
15 would also occur within Local Responsibility Areas as well under the current General
16 Plan scenario. As such, build out of the existing General Plan would result in
17 cumulatively considerable increases wildfire hazards within Riverside County.

18 Buildout according to the General Plan with GPA No. 960 would reduce the amount of
19 developed uses allowed within interface/wildland areas (by over 15,000 acres) and
20 increase the amount of vacant and open space land. These changes, however, would
21 be offset by increased development of urban/suburban and public facility uses in SRAs
22 and LRAs. The incremental contributions of each of these increases are individually
23 minor. However, given the significant wildland fire hazards already associated with
24 General Plan build out, even these increases would be cumulatively considerable.

25 For the cumulative scenario, both SRAs and LRAs would see even greater increases in
26 developed uses. This is particularly true of rural/agricultural uses in SRAs and
27 urban/suburban uses in LRAs. Interface/wildland uses would actually decrease under
28 the cumulative scenario. However, nearly all of the acreage decreased would instead

1 be converted to urban/ suburban or rural/agricultural uses and thus would
2 substantially reduce cumulative impacts. Thus, overall, the cumulative General Plan
3 buildout scenario would also result in incremental increases in fire hazard potential
4 that are individually minor but cumulatively considerable.

5 The incremental effect of growth within Riverside County would result in cumulatively
6 considerable fire hazard increases regardless of the General Plan build out scenario,
7 including the future growth associated with the Project. Even with regulatory
8 compliance described above in the "Project Impacts" section of this document,
9 however, the Project would contribute substantially to significant cumulative impacts
10 due to increased people and property in areas at risk for high or very high fire
11 hazards, particularly within interface/wildland areas. Build out of the cumulative
12 General Plan scenario would do likewise. Due to the vast expanse covered by
13 Riverside County, the wide variety of potential fire sources and fuels, and the sheer
14 number of people and properties involved, even with the reduction of individual
15 implementing projects to less than significant levels, the wildfire risk within Riverside
16 County overall would remain cumulatively considerable for all of the General Plan
17 build out scenarios. There is no feasible mitigation that would fully reduce these
18 cumulative impacts to below the level of significance. Thus, even though Project
19 effects would be individually limited, GPA No. 960's incremental contribution to
20 cumulative housing and population impacts would be significant and unavoidable.
21 Build out of the cumulative General Plan scenario would also result in significant and
22 unavoidable cumulative impacts to population and housing within Riverside County,
23 even when implemented alongside the regulations, policies, and mitigation measures
24 detailed in the "Project Impacts" section of this document.

25 Cumulative Mitigation:

26 As discussed above, even with regulatory compliance discussed on pages 5-134 and 5-
27 135 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521, cumulative impacts relative to wildlife fire exposure
28

1 would not be reduced to a less than significant level. Impacts would remain
2 cumulatively significant.

3 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-132 through 5-135

4 J. Noise

5 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.15.A) Generate Noise or Cause Noise Exposure in Excess of
6 Standards

7 Under any of the General Plan buildout scenarios, future development of noise-
8 sensitive uses would occur in areas that either are currently exposed to or would be
9 exposed to future traffic, airport or railroad noise levels that exceed the current
10 standards, resulting in incremental increases in the number of people and properties
11 exposed. Such development could also cause incremental exposure to noise from
12 non-transportation (stationary) noise sources that exceed standards. Where setbacks
13 and other mitigation measures are not feasible or do not sufficiently lower noise
14 levels, such impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

15 Future development would also contribute incrementally to increased traffic volumes
16 on county roads, resulting in noise increases affecting sensitive land uses along
17 existing and future roads. As a result, new development, particularly residential uses
18 along and adjacent to major transit corridors, could be exposed to noise levels that
19 exceed Riverside County's noise standards. Existing sensitive uses (residences,
20 schools, etc.) would also be subject to these higher noise levels. Mitigation, such as
21 setbacks and insulation are feasible for new uses. Compliance with existing noise
22 standards, State and County regulatory programs, General Plan policies and existing
23 mitigation measures from EIR No. 441 described above in the "Project Impacts"
24 section of this document would aid in reducing the significant unavoidable cumulative
25 effects of noise on new development. However, noise levels would increase
26 incrementally over time to levels exceeding Riverside County noise standards, and
27 thus exposure of existing sensitive uses would be significant and unavoidable.
28 Mitigation of the extremely small but numerous incremental increases that lead to

1 this significant impact is infeasible due to the extremely widespread nature of the
2 impacts.

3 Cumulative Mitigation:

4 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.13.2A, 4.13.2B, 4.13.2C, 4.13.2D, 4.13.3A, 4.13.3B, and
5 4.13.3C, described above, would reduce cumulative (incremental) impacts associated
6 with long-term noise sources that would exceed Riverside County noise standards,
7 however, not to a level that is less than significant. Cumulative noise exposure in
8 excess of standards would remain a cumulatively significant impact even with
9 implementation of these mitigation measures.

10 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-144 through 5-147

11 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.15.C) Result in a Substantial Permanent Increase in
12 Ambient Noise Levels

13 Future development accommodated by any of the General Plan buildout scenarios,
14 including that with the Project, would result in cumulatively considerable increases in
15 ambient noise levels and in the number of people and noise-sensitive land uses
16 exposed to substantial noise levels. It would also incrementally increase ambient
17 noise levels throughout Riverside County to cumulatively considerable levels in some
18 places (where regulatory and mitigation measures are insufficient to reduce noise
19 impacts). These measures would be sufficient when applied to new development, but
20 are not feasible for existing development. Thus, for impacts to existing noise-sensitive
21 uses, however, the widespread, diffuse nature of the noise impacts, particularly those
22 from increase traffic volumes resulting from buildout of any of the General Plan
23 scenarios, as well as from the Project itself, would result in cumulatively significant
24 impacts that cannot be feasibly reduced to acceptable noise levels. Thus, the Project
25 would result in incremental generation or cumulative exposure of existing uses to
26 excessive noise in some areas, or would result in a cumulatively substantial
27 permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Compliance with abovementioned
28 existing laws, federal, State and County regulatory programs, General Plan policies

1 and the existing mitigation measures from EIR No. 441, would aid in reducing
2 potential significant and unavoidable potential impacts due to increased noise levels
3 (refer to the "Project Impacts" section of this document). However, these cumulative
4 impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for the reasons outlined herein,
5 even with implementation of mitigation.

6 Cumulative Mitigation:

7 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.13.2A, 4.13.2B, 4.13.2C, 4.13.2D, 4.13.3A, 4.13.3B and
8 4.13.3C, described above in the "Project Impacts" section, are applicable to
9 cumulative impacts as well. While these measures would reduce cumulative impacts
10 due to a permanent increase in ambient noise levels, they would not be sufficient to
11 reduce cumulative impacts to a less than significant impact. Cumulative impacts
12 would remain significant for the reasons described herein.

13 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-144 through 5-147

14 3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.15.D) Result in a Substantial Temporary or Periodic
15 Increase in Ambient Noise Levels

16 Future development accommodated by any of the General Plan buildout scenarios,
17 including that with the Project, would result in cumulatively considerable increases in
18 ambient noise levels and in the number of people and noise-sensitive land uses
19 exposed to substantial noise levels. Compliance with the abovementioned existing
20 laws, regulatory programs, and General Plan policies, as well as the existing mitigation
21 measures from EIR No. 441, would aid in reducing potential short-term noise impacts
22 (refer to the discussion under the "Project Impacts" section of this document).
23 However, GPA No. 960 would also incrementally increase ambient noise levels
24 throughout Riverside County to cumulatively considerable levels in some places
25 (where regulatory and mitigation measures are insufficient to reduce noise impacts).
26 These measures would be sufficient when applied to new development, but are not
27 feasible for existing development. Thus, for impacts to existing noise-sensitive uses,
28 however, the widespread, diffuse nature of the noise impacts, particularly those from

1 increase traffic volumes resulting from buildout of any of the General Plan scenarios,
2 as well as from the Project itself, would result in cumulatively significant impacts that
3 cannot be feasibly reduced to acceptable noise levels. Thus, the Project would result
4 in incremental generation or cumulative exposure of existing uses to excessive noise
5 in some areas, or would result in a cumulatively substantial temporary increase in
6 ambient noise levels. These cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable
7 for the reasons outlined herein, even with implementation of mitigation.

8 Cumulative Mitigation:

9 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.13.1A and 4.13.1B, described above in the "Project
10 Impacts" Section, are applicable to cumulative impacts as well. While these measures
11 would reduce cumulative impacts due to temporary increases in ambient noise levels,
12 they would not be sufficient to reduce cumulative impacts to a less than significant
13 impact. Cumulative impacts would remain significant for the reasons described
14 herein.

15 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-144 through 5-147

16 K. Parks and Recreation

17 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.16.A) Increase the Use of Existing Parks of Other
18 Recreational Facilities Resulting in Their Substantial Physical Deterioration

19 Growth pressures within Riverside County will result in development that causes the
20 incremental increases in use of existing parks, trails and other recreational facilities,
21 both within unincorporated Riverside County and its cities, regardless of the General
22 Plan buildout scenario. Provision of additional facilities, as per the policies and
23 regulations discussed on page 5-151 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521, would offset many
24 of these impacts. However, due to the sheer size of the population growth, overall
25 impacts to existing facilities would be cumulatively considerable for any of the
26 General Plan buildout scenarios analyzed in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521. Similarly,
27 future development pursuant to any of the scenarios would also increase demand for
28 additional trails and bikeways within new development and increase use of existing

1 trails and bikeways, particularly those that connect new uses to existing destinations
2 (schools, bus stops, retail areas, etc.). Therefore, where new facilities are not provided
3 to offset such increased use, this would contribute to cumulatively substantial
4 increases in the wear and tear on existing park and recreational facilities, including
5 trails. Compliance with the abovementioned existing State and County regulatory
6 programs and General Plan policies would further aid in reducing significant and
7 unavoidable cumulative Project-related effects on existing parks or recreation
8 facilities (refer to the discussion under the "Project Impacts" section of this
9 document). However, due to the inherently growth-inducing and growth-
10 accommodating nature of a General Plan, there is no feasible mitigation to fully
11 reduce this cumulative impact to below the level of significance. Thus, even though
12 Project effects would be individually limited, the cumulative (incremental)
13 contribution to impacts on existing parks and recreational facilities would be
14 significant and unavoidable.

15 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-150 and 5-151

16 L. Public Facilities

- 17 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impacts 4.17.A: Cause Adverse Environmental Effects Due to the
18 Need for Fire Protection Services, 4.17.B: Cause Adverse Environmental Effects Due to the
19 Need for Law Enforcement Services, 4.17.C(1): Adversely Affect or Exceed the Permitted
20 Capacity of a Landfill, 4.17.D: Cause Adverse Environmental Effects Due to the Need for
21 Schools, 4.17.E: Cause Adverse Environmental Effects Due to the Need for Library Services,
22 and 4.17.F: Cause Adverse Environmental Effects Due to the Need for Medical Facilities)

23 The ongoing growth of Riverside County over time will introduce people, property and
24 structures into previously undeveloped areas and also increase urban densities
25 through infill and expansion, all of which would require adequate public services and
26 facilities to ensure their health, safety and well-being. In terms of future conditions, a
27 variety of data and analyses were collected or performed to determine what effects
28 buildout of Riverside County over time (in any of the respective scenarios, including

1 cumulative) would have on existing public facilities, as well as the demand for future
2 services. The results of these analyses are shown in the following tables in on pages 5-
3 157 through 5-159 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521: Table 5.5-X, "*Cumulative Effect on*
4 *Theoretical Demand for Fire Protection*"; Table 5.5-Y, "*Cumulative Effect on*
5 *Theoretical Demand for Law Enforcement*"; Table 5.5-Z, "*Cumulative Effect on*
6 *Theoretical Solid Waste Generation*"; Table 5.5-AA, "*Cumulative Effect on Theoretical*
7 *Student Generation*"; Table 5.5-AB, "*Cumulative Effect on Theoretical Library*
8 *Demand*"; and Table 5.5-AC, "*Cumulative Effect on Theoretical Hospital Demand.*"

9 These tables show the cumulative conditions for the three General Plan buildout
10 scenarios examined in Section 5.5, including the cumulative scenario.

11 It should be noted that the public services addressed here encompass the jurisdictions
12 and responsibilities of numerous independent public agencies, both within and at
13 times outside of Riverside County. Thus, for baseline (existing) services, a theoretical
14 value is used rather than actual data because of the variability in existing conditions
15 and the amount of data available. For all of the metrics, the same modeling
16 procedures used to estimate theoretical needs in Section 4.17, "*Public Facilities*" of
17 EIR No. 521 were used. Estimates consist of theoretical data because specific area-by-
18 area calculations for each resource, using each independent agency's own variables
19 and procedures were beyond the scope of this programmatic analysis. Also,
20 controlling these variables in the modeling process by using standardized factors
21 countywide enables valid comparisons amongst the various scenarios without
22 inconsistencies caused by varying models amongst agencies.

23 These data should not be construed as the actual specific demands for public facilities
24 that shall arise for a given location. Such determinations will be made on a project-by-
25 project basis as development occurs and may vary based on the surrounding area. For
26 resources or areas overseen by a specific public entity (e.g., individual school
27 districts), that agency will have final say on the future facilities needed, as well as
28 where, how, when and to what standards such facilities are ultimately developed.

1 Further, each agency has its own plans, standards and requirements that will apply.
2 The values presented here are for comparative planning purposes only.

3 The theoretical projections are also based on the assumption that all the land uses
4 proposed under each scenario will develop fully and as mapped/planned. As such,
5 each represents the theoretical, worst-case scenario and likely over-states the actual
6 real-world development potential likely to result, even though in real life, 100-percent
7 build out of all areas throughout the County is highly unlikely based on historical
8 development patterns. Actual future development of individual parcels and areas
9 mapped in the various buildout scenarios are subject to the discretion of many
10 hundreds to thousands of individual property owners, including private individuals,
11 business entities and even various public agencies and other entities. The County has
12 little to no control over the decision to propose development (new or redeveloped)
13 on a given site although the County is the entity with discretion for review and
14 approval of such development applications for most cases within unincorporated
15 Riverside County. Demand for additional development is often a result of many
16 interrelated factors, including population growth and economic demand, as well as
17 location, local supply, infrastructure availability, costs, etc.

18 Review of the theoretical demand calculations in the tables below reveal several
19 trends, which is expected since each is derived from the same population and land
20 use data. In general, buildout of the current General Plan will result in cumulatively
21 significant impacts across the gamut of public services. For many, the demand for
22 services will be roughly doubled over the next 50 or so years. This applies to schools,
23 as evidenced by the predicted 151% increase in the expected number of students by
24 2060. Law enforcement services show nearly 700 (205%) additional sworn officers
25 being needed. Library services show over 2.8 million volumes would be needed to
26 serve the projected buildout population of Riverside County. Similarly, demand for
27 medical services would also be significantly affected, as indicated by the projected
28 209% increase in the number of hospital beds that would be needed to serve the

1 population of Riverside County at buildout. Further, these projections are merely
2 indicators for the overall needs of each public service; for example, to meet the needs
3 of the students projected per Table 5.5-AA, affected primary school districts will need
4 to incrementally add schools, teachers, support staff, etc., for elementary, middle and
5 high school, as the student census increases. Secondary education services and
6 facilities, such as continuing education and adult schools, junior colleges, vocational
7 schools and universities, as well as private schools, specialty schools, etc., will be
8 similarly affected.

9 For a few public services, current General Plan buildout would contribute fewer, but
10 still significant, cumulative increases. These include fire protective services, which
11 have a projected increase in demand of 25% over existing needs. These demands take
12 the form of increased numbers of both people and property needing protection from
13 fires, both urban and wildfires. For fire services, cumulative impacts are particularly
14 significant due to the extensive incremental expansion of urban fringes and rural
15 development into interface/wildland and open, undeveloped areas that are at greater
16 risk for wildland fires (see Section 4.17.2 in EIR No. 521) and also more remote, which
17 results in longer response times and greater difficulty in providing services. For solid
18 waste disposal capacity, the projected increase is also cumulatively significant, 43%
19 over the next 50-plus years. The various waste stream reduction and recycling
20 (diversion) laws enacted by the state and implemented at the county and city level
21 continue to contribute to the lower rates of cumulative increase being projected.
22 Nevertheless, because of existing environmental constraints, landfill siting difficulties
23 and also the long-term environmental impacts inherent in landfill operations
24 (particularly emissions from trucks hauling wastes), EIR No. 441, certified for the
25 current General Plan, found these cumulative impacts to be significant for existing
26 waste disposal facilities.

27 As shown in the tables cited above, buildout of each of the various General Plan
28 scenarios shown will contribute incrementally to utilization of existing public facilities

1 and demand for additional public facilities and services in Riverside County. On a
2 cumulative basis, the effect of General Plan buildout with the Project added to it
3 would generally be very slightly reduced (1-2%). Compared to the environmental
4 baseline, however, the incremental increases in demand on public services would be
5 cumulatively considerable due mainly to the constraints upon the County of
6 Riverside's ability to mitigate demands. For the cumulative projects, most services
7 would see an incremental increase of 1-6%. For this alternative, all of the projected
8 cumulative impacts would be significant, particularly the increase in demand for solid
9 waste disposal due to the increased amount of commercial land uses proposed.

10 Therefore, it has been determined that future development will contribute
11 incrementally to cumulative impacts to public services and facilities as Riverside
12 County builds out over time pursuant to the Riverside County General Plan (regardless
13 of the various applicable regulations, policies, and mitigation measures described in
14 the "Project Impacts" section of this document). Specific impacts of the severities
15 indicated will include the following:

16 Fire Protection Services

- 17 • Future development would introduce additional people and property requiring
18 fire protection and emergency response services. This would result in
19 additional fire and emergency responses from existing facilities, increasing
20 wear and tear on equipment and necessitating additional facilities and staff.
21 Where the incremental increase in demand exceeds available services, this
22 impact would be cumulatively significant for any of the buildout scenarios.
- 23 • When new development is located outside the normal radius for acceptable
24 response times, in particular in the urban fringe and wildland areas, additional
25 wildland fire hazards would be created or exacerbated, with people and
26 property at increased risk due to delayed response. In areas without adequate
27 services nearby, this could result in the exposure of people and property to
28 high fire hazard conditions without adequate fire protection.

- Fire and emergency vehicles and equipment responding would experience increased wear and tear due to additional distances traveled. Increased travel times would also decrease the number of calls that could be responded to during a shift. When demand is great enough in a given region, additional fire facilities would be built. However, the provision of additional services would also require financial resources to support additional manpower, equipment and fire stations or other facilities.
- Existing fire facilities may be expanded or new facilities constructed to ensure adequate levels of service and response times. In particular, new fire stations would be needed to serve outlying wildland and urban fringes as growth expands into these areas. In areas where development remains sparse and new facilities are not added, response times may drop below acceptable levels. This impact would be cumulatively significant.
- The construction of new fire stations has the potential to cause adverse environmental impacts in their own right. They will, however, be subject to a number of regulatory measures, Riverside County building codes, CEQA mitigation measures, etc., which should be sufficient to ensure no significant environmental impacts occur. See discussion for Impact 4.17.A in Section 4.17.2 of EIR No. 521.
- Overall, future growth within unincorporated Riverside County, including as a result of GPA No. 960, will substantially contribute to a significant cumulative impact on fire protection personnel, equipment and facilities.

Law Enforcement Services

- New development would introduce additional people and property requiring law enforcement services, including emergency response. This would result in additional routine and emergency responses from existing facilities and create demand for additional facilities and staff. Where the incremental increase in

1 demand exceeds available services, this impact would be cumulatively
2 significant for any of the buildout scenarios.

- 3 • When new development is located outside the normal radius for acceptable
4 response times, in particular in the urban fringe and wildland areas, hazards
5 related to personal safety and crime would be created or exacerbated, and
6 people and property would be at increased risk due to delayed response. In
7 areas without adequate services nearby, this could result in the exposure of
8 people and property to higher safety hazards and security risks.
- 9 • Law enforcement (e.g., County Sheriff Department) vehicles and equipment
10 responding to calls would experience increased wear and tear due to
11 additional distances traveled. Increased travel times would also decrease the
12 number of calls that could be responded to during a shift. When demand is
13 great enough in a given region, additional facilities (i.e., Sheriff Dept.
14 substations) would be built. However, the provision of additional services
15 would also require financial resources to support additional manpower,
16 equipment, substations, correctional facilities, legal/judicial services, etc.
- 17 • Existing law enforcement facilities may be expanded and/or new facilities
18 constructed to ensure adequate levels of service and response times
19 throughout Riverside County. In particular, new substations would be needed
20 to serve outlying wildland and urban fringes as growth expands into these
21 areas. In areas where development remains sparse and new facilities are not
22 added, however, response times may drop below acceptable levels. This
23 impact would be cumulatively significant, regardless of buildout scenario.
- 24 • The construction of new substations has the potential to cause adverse
25 environmental impacts in their own right. They will, however, be subject to a
26 number of regulatory measures, Riverside County building codes, CEQA
27 mitigation measures, etc., which should be sufficient to ensure no significant
28

1 environmental impacts occur. See discussion for Impact 4.17.B in Section
2 4.17.3 of EIR No. 521.

- 3 • Overall, future growth within unincorporated Riverside County, including as a
4 result of GPA No. 960, will substantially contribute to a significant cumulative
5 impact on law enforcement (e.g., County Sheriff Department) personnel,
6 equipment and facilities.

7 Solid Waste Management

- 8 • The growth population from new residential uses and jobs and economic
9 activity from new commercial, industrial and institutional uses occurring as
10 Riverside County builds out over time would result in a corresponding increase
11 the amount of solid waste generated by these various uses. The disposal of
12 this additional waste would incrementally increase the wastes going into
13 existing landfills, potentially hastening the end of their usable lives, and
14 contribute to the need for new or expanded sanitary landfill facilities.
- 15 • Continued growth within Riverside County will incrementally increase the
16 amount of refuse and other solid waste generated, also causing a
17 corresponding increase in the need for disposal services, including hauling,
18 sorting, recycling, ABOP and hazardous materials disposal, as well as an
19 increased need for landfill space. It would also incrementally increase the
20 number (and/or duration) of truck trips occurring within Riverside County for
21 the collection of said wastes.
- 22 • The increase in disposal need may hasten existing landfills in reaching their
23 permitted capacity, decreasing their expected lifespan. This incremental
24 contribution of growth, as projected for the proposed Project or any of the
25 other General Plan buildout scenarios, will result in incremental, but non-
26 substantial, cumulative impacts to existing landfills.
- 27 • Continued long-range planning by the Riverside County Waste Management
28 Department will ensure that new disposal facilities (landfills) are developed to

1 meet increasing needs and, in particular, to accommodate the loss of existing
2 landfills as they reach permitted capacity and lifespan. The construction of
3 additional landfills would be addressed through both existing mitigation and
4 additional mitigation as deemed necessary based on project-specific analyses.

5 Schools

- 6 • New development will incrementally introduce additional people, particularly
7 schoolchildren, requiring school services within Riverside County. This would
8 result in the need for additional classroom space, as well as teaching and
9 support staff at levels exceeding current capacity. Where increased demand
10 (increased student populations) exceeds available school services and space,
11 impacts will be cumulatively substantial, for any of the General Plan buildout
12 scenarios. Mitigation for such impacts will be provided in accordance with
13 Riverside County Ordinance No. 575 and state law pursuant to the Leroy F.
14 Green School Facilities Act (aka Senate Bill 50), which prohibits local agencies
15 from imposing school impact mitigation fees, dedications or other
16 requirements in excess of those provided by statute. However, to the extent
17 the financial resources generated pursuant to statute are not sufficient to
18 satisfy demand, cumulatively significant school impacts would result.
- 19 • Where increases trigger new school facilities or expansion of existing facilities,
20 environmental impacts may occur in association with their construction
21 and/or operation. Adverse environmental impacts would be associated with
22 construction of new school sites/facilities to the extent their location,
23 construction methods or operations affect the surrounding area. The
24 construction of additional school facilities, particularly large campuses
25 associated with high schools, have the potential to result in additional
26 cumulatively significant environmental impacts in their own right.

27 ///

28 ///

1 Library Services

- 2 • New development will incrementally introduce additional people utilizing
- 3 library services within Riverside County. This would result in the need for
- 4 additional library space, reading material and media, as well as librarians and
- 5 support staff. Where increased demand exceeds available library services,
- 6 impacts will be cumulatively substantial for any of the General Plan buildout
- 7 scenarios if not met with additional services and facilities.
- 8 • Mitigation of cumulative impacts to library services will be contingent upon
- 9 the ability of the County to provide adequate funding and the availability of
- 10 suitable library sites. Where such financial resources are not sufficient to meet
- 11 increased need, or where increased service provision lags behind the
- 12 incremental increase in demand, cumulatively significant impacts to library
- 13 services will result.
- 14 • Where increases trigger the need for new libraries or the expansion of existing
- 15 facilities, environmental impacts may occur in association with their
- 16 construction and/or operation. However, due to the relatively small footprints
- 17 typically associated with libraries, their typically centralized, urban locations,
- 18 as well as the potential for existing buildings to be retrofitted as libraries,
- 19 environmental impacts associated with the construction of new facilities can
- 20 feasibly be limited to less than significant levels.

21 Medical Services and Services

- 22 • New development will incrementally introduce additional people within
- 23 Riverside County needing a wide range of health and medical services. This
- 24 would result in a corresponding increase in the need for additional medical
- 25 facilities, including community clinics, hospitals, mental health services,
- 26 specialty services, skilled nursing facilities, rehabilitation units, pharmacies,
- 27 imaging and diagnostic laboratories and services, public health services, etc.,
- 28 as well as the skilled staff needed to operate them. Where increased demand

1 exceeds available services, impacts would be cumulatively substantial for any
2 of the General Plan buildout scenarios if not met with additional services and
3 facilities.

- 4 • Mitigation of cumulative impacts to Riverside County medical services will be
5 contingent upon the ability of the County to provide adequate funding and the
6 availability of suitable sites. Where such financial resources are not sufficient
7 to meet increased need, or where increased service provision lags behind the
8 incremental increase in demand, cumulatively significant impacts will result.
9 This may be particularly true for remote, rural or other underserved areas
10 distant from existing major medical centers.
- 11 • Where increases trigger the need for new or expanded medical facilities,
12 environmental impacts may occur in association with their construction
13 and/or operation. For community clinics and other smaller scale facilities, the
14 relatively small typical footprints and their typically centralized, urban
15 locations, as well as the potential for retrofitting of existing buildings,
16 environmental impacts associated with the construction of new medical or
17 health facilities can feasibly be limited to less than significant levels.
- 18 • For major medical centers that will be needed to serve growing regions,
19 however, adverse environmental impacts would be associated with
20 construction of new facilities to the extent their location, construction
21 methods and operations affect the surrounding area. Thus, the large campuses
22 typically associated with major medical centers have the potential to result in
23 additional significant environmental impacts in their own right.

24 Cumulative Mitigation:

25 Implementation of key regulations, General Plan policies and mitigation measures
26 provided on pages 5-159 through 5-161 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521, would help
27 reduce, avoid or minimize the various cumulative impacts to public services and
28 facilities. Specifically, Existing Mitigation Measures 4.15.2A, 4.15.2B, 4.15.2C, 4.15.2D,

1 4.15.3A, 4.15.3B, 4.15.3C, 4.15.3D, 4.15.3E, 4.15.3F, 4.15.6A, 4.15.7A, and 4.15.7B are
2 applicable to cumulative impacts to public facilities; refer to pages 5-160 and 5-161 in
3 Section 5.5 for the full text of these measures. However, while public service impacts
4 associated with the Project, GPA No. 960, are individually less than significant, for
5 some public services, incremental impacts will remain cumulatively substantial, even
6 with the implementation of all feasible mitigation. Specifically, incremental increases
7 in demand for fire protection and law enforcement services, schools, libraries and
8 medical services will be cumulatively significant under any of the buildout scenarios
9 examined herein.

10 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-156 through 5-166

11 **M. Transportation and Circulation**

- 12 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.18.A: Conflict with an Applicable Plan, Ordinance or Policy
13 Establishing a Measure of Effectiveness for the Performance of the Circulation System,
14 Taking into Account All Modes of Transportation, Including Mass Transit and Non-
15 Motorized Travel and Relevant Components of the Circulation System, Including, but Not
16 Limited to Intersections, Streets, Highways and Freeways, Pedestrian and Bicycle Paths
17 and Mass Transit, Impact 4.18.B: Conflict with an Applicable Congestion Management
18 Program, Including, but Not Limited to Level of Service Targets and Travel Demand
19 Measures, or Other Targets Established by the County Congestion Management Agency
20 for Designated Roads or Highways

21 The Circulation Element policies provide a framework for development and
22 implementation of the multi-modal transportation system envisioned by the General
23 Plan, as proposed by the Project, GPA No. 960. However, even with the identified
24 policies, numerous facilities will operate at unacceptable levels of service. Future
25 development accommodated by any of the General Plan buildout scenarios would
26 result in cumulatively considerable increases in traffic levels with related decreases in
27 roadway segments operating at acceptable standards at various locations throughout
28

1 Riverside County based on both existing and projected traffic volumes and roadway
2 configurations.

3 As a result, some roadways within Riverside County would also conflict with
4 applicable congestion management plan standards or policies, such as level of service
5 standards and travel demand measures. Implementation of the various regulatory
6 programs and mitigation measures listed above in the "Project Impacts" section of
7 this document, as well as on pages 5-177 through 5-179 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521,
8 would help reduce the above cumulative impacts, but according to the analysis
9 provided in Section 4.18.5, *"Transportation and Circulation"* of EIR No. 521, they
10 would not be fully sufficient to ensure that all cumulative impacts are reduced to less
11 than significant levels. The changes proposed under the Project (GPA No. 960) serve
12 to reduce the predicted traffic generated and raise the LOS improvement trigger
13 ranges, resulting in a forecast of lower traffic impacts when compared to the existing
14 General Plan. When compared against the existing environmental conditions,
15 however, the Project will still result in cumulatively considerable traffic impacts as a
16 result of General Plan implementation.

17 Cumulative Mitigation:

18 The following existing and new mitigation measures are also applicable to all future
19 General Plan implementing projects and their cumulative impacts. Compliance with
20 these measures would help mitigate significant cumulative transportation and
21 circulation impacts, however, not to a level that is less than significant. Refer to the
22 "Project Impacts" section of this document for further discussion.

23 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.16.1A states "As part of its review of land development
24 proposals, the County shall require project proponents to make a "fair share"
25 contribution to required intersection and/or roadway improvements. The required
26 intersection and/or roadway improvements shall be based on maintaining the
27 appropriate level of service (LOS D within Community Development Areas designated
28 by the 2002 Riverside County General Plan and within adjacent jurisdictions; LOS C

1 within those portions of unincorporated Riverside County outside of Community
2 Development Areas). The fair share contribution shall be based on the percentage of
3 project-related traffic to the total future traffic."

4 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.16.1B states "As part of its review of land development
5 proposals, the County shall ensure sufficient right-of-way is reserved on critical
6 roadways and at critical intersections to implement the approach lane geometrics
7 necessary to provide the appropriate levels of services."

8 New Mitigation Measure 4.18.1A-N1 states "As part of its review of land development
9 proposals, the County shall require project proponents to make a "fair share"
10 contribution to required intersection and/or roadway improvements. The required
11 intersection and/or roadway improvements shall be based on maintaining the
12 appropriate level of service (LOS D or better). The fair share contribution shall be
13 based on the percentage of project-related traffic to the total future traffic."

14 New Mitigation Measure 4.18.1B-N1 states that as part of its review of land
15 development proposals, the County shall ensure sufficient right-of-way is reserved on
16 critical roadways and at critical intersections to implement the approach lane
17 geometrics necessary to provide the appropriate levels of services.

18 New Mitigation Measure 4.18.1C-N1 states, "The County [of Riverside] shall seek ways
19 and means to increase the capacity of Circulation Element roadways (where needed
20 and appropriate) by such measures as adding through-travel lanes or additional
21 turning lanes without increasing the right-of-way width requirement for the
22 classification of the facility."

23 New Mitigation Measure 4.18.1D-N1 states, "The County [of Riverside] shall
24 collaborate with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and other
25 appropriate agencies (where needed and appropriate) to add auxiliary and mainline
26 lanes on the freeway system within available rights-of-way."

27 New Mitigation Measure 4.18.1E-N1 states, "The County [of Riverside] shall
28 collaborate with Caltrans and other appropriate agencies to develop direct

connections between the HOV/HOT lanes at the following freeway interchanges: I-15 at SR-91, SR-60 at SR-91/I-215 West junction, SR-60 at I-215 East junction, and at other locations as needed. To the extent that such improvements may be possible within existing rights-of-way, environmental impacts would be less than significant."

New Mitigation Measure 4.18.1F-N1 states, "The County [of Riverside] shall collaborate with Caltrans and other appropriate agencies (where appropriate) to develop HOV lanes along the entire length of I-215 within Riverside County and along I-10 between the San Bernardino County line and Indio."

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-175 through 5-179

N. Water Resources

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.19.A): Result in Insufficient Water Supply

Over time, ongoing growth will increase the amount of people, property, structures and new uses in the County, which will generate additional demand for water supplies. Table 5.5-AE, "*Cumulative Effect on Theoretical Potable Water Demand*" on pages 5-183 and 5-184 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521 provides a summary of demand for potable water within the County according to theoretical estimates associated with existing land uses, as well as for each of the General Plan buildout scenarios listed. As shown in Table 5.5-AE, buildout of each of the various General Plan scenarios shown will contribute incrementally to utilization of existing water and sewer infrastructure, as well as increase demand for water from both local and imported sources.

For potable water, Table 5.5-AE indicates existing General Plan buildout will nearly double demand by roughly 318,000 acre-feet per year. Meeting this demand will require additional water supplies from a combination of imported (i.e., state), local (groundwater) and recycled/reclaimed water sources. All of these supply sources are extremely limited in their capacities to provide additional water. Increased reliance on local groundwater sources would further increase the rate of basin drawdown and the cumulative effects, such as poor water quality and harm to biota, that result.

1 Although there is room for increased utilization of recycled and reclaimed water
2 sources, and indeed most water districts are aggressively pursuing improved
3 efficiencies for these sources, such programs remain relatively costly using current
4 technologies.

5 As a result, even though buildout of the General Plan with the Project added would
6 incrementally decrease cumulative potable water demand slightly (as compared to
7 existing General Plan build out [CURR scenario]), the Project's contribution is still
8 cumulatively considerable on a countywide basis when compared to baseline
9 environmental conditions (EXIST scenario). The cumulative GPAs buildout scenario,
10 with an 11% increase in demand over the existing General Plan, would also have a
11 cumulatively significant impact on water supply. Thus, based on the present level of
12 water planning and supply allocation for the state in general, and the water agencies
13 serving Riverside County in particular, buildout of any of the General Plan scenarios
14 would cumulatively result in an "insufficient water supply" within Riverside County.

15 Table 5.5-AG, "*Cumulative Effect on Theoretical Water Supply and Suppliers*" shows a
16 *theoretical* projection of how additional development accommodated by the various
17 scenarios would increase demand for water supplies within each of the service areas
18 of the various major (wholesale) water suppliers located in the County. Continued
19 urbanization and growth within western Riverside County would yield increases of 50-
20 100% in developed uses needing potable water service within the major water
21 districts' service areas (particularly EMWD and WMWD). Similar trends would also
22 occur in the Coachella Valley. Though currently less developed than western county
23 areas, the Coachella Valley increases are even more cumulatively significant due to
24 the extremely limited water supply to the region and it's extremely hot and dry desert
25 climate. For both regions, however, impacts to available water supplies will be
26 cumulatively significant for any of the build out scenarios analyzed.

27 Of particular concern are the areas that fall under "Rest (Not in Water Districts),"
28 which are areas not served by existing water agencies. As such, development in these

1 areas must rely upon self-produced water, typically from on-site (or local area)
2 groundwater pumping, assuming such water is available and of sufficient quality for
3 residential use. All three scenarios show a common trend of large losses of vacant
4 open space areas as development spreads further in the interface fringe and wildland
5 areas of Riverside County. Because of the remote nature of such areas and lack of
6 public water services, this type of development pattern has a significant effect on
7 groundwater basins. Notwithstanding recent changes in California water law, the
8 pumping of groundwater on private property is largely unregulated and
9 unconstrained. For this reason, groundwater demand is a classic example of the type
10 of incremental uses that are individually inconsiderable (e.g., groundwater pumped
11 and used by an individual household) but cumulatively significant. As a result of the
12 incremental usage, where demand exceeds recharge rates, such levels of
13 groundwater drawdown are not sustainable, particularly in dry years or during
14 prolonged drought conditions. The resultant drawdown causes significant adverse
15 environmental impacts, both to the homeowner, whose well may go dry, and to the
16 natural ecosystem, plants and animals that all rely on local water supplies for their
17 survival.

18 Future development (pursuant to any of the buildout scenarios discussed, including
19 the with-Project scenario) will incrementally increase demand for water supplies in
20 areas where such supplies are insufficient or unavailable to serve the project from
21 existing entitlements and resources. This will necessitate new or expanded water
22 supplies (entitlements) in order to adequately serve future development. In some
23 areas, the adequacy of water supplies is already known to be insufficient or supplies
24 are already utilized at their maximum sustainable level. In both cases, water supplies
25 would be insufficient to meet incremental increases in demand using existing
26 technologies.

27 Due to the variability and unpredictability of water supplies from year to year, in some
28 cases, the adequacy of future water supplies cannot be ascertained at this time at the

1 programmatic level of EIR No. 521. Even through a demonstrated compliance with
2 abovementioned existing laws, federal, State and County regulatory programs,
3 General Plan policies and the existing mitigation measures from EIR No. 441 described
4 below, in light of future growth, as well as environmental and regulatory constraints,
5 adequate water supplies for all forecast future development cannot be assured. As a
6 result, in areas of Riverside County where sufficient water supply is not available or
7 cannot be assured into the future, cumulative impacts would be significant and
8 unavoidable.

9 Cumulative Mitigation:

10 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.1C, 4.17.1D, 4.17.1E, described in the "Mitigation"
11 discussion above, as well as Existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.2A and 4.17.3A,
12 described under Impact 4.19.B, below, are also applicable to cumulative impacts.
13 These measures would aid in reducing impacts to water supplies, however, not a less
14 than significant level. Cumulative impacts to water supply would remain significant
15 and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation.

16 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-183 through 5-189 and 5-195 through 5-198

17 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.19.B) Substantially Deplete Groundwater Supplies or
18 Interfere Substantially With Groundwater Recharge

19 At present roughly one-third of Riverside County's water demand is met by
20 groundwater, according to the cumulative analysis on water resources in Section 5.5
21 of EIR No. 521 (page 5-180). In regards to effects on local, groundwater supplies,
22 Table 5.5-AH, "Cumulative Effect on Groundwater Basins" on pages 5-186 and 5-187 in
23 Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521 shows the amount of land within the various regions' basins
24 affected by the various development categories. (Basins are grouped by region
25 because they are too numerous to depict individually; see Appendix EIR-11 in EIR No.
26 521 for full details and data.) In the urbanizing regions (western Riverside County and
27 the Coachella Valley), the table shows the general trend of lands going from less
28 intense interface/wildland uses vacant/open space uses to more intense

1 urban/suburban uses. The mostly rural areas (far east region and areas not underlain
2 by any groundwater basin) show a similar shift from rural to urban as well. Both the
3 with-project (GPU) and CULM build out scenarios show the familiar trend of growth
4 and urbanization pressures causing interface areas and wildlands to convert to more
5 rural, suburban and urban uses. This trend is particularly evident in the Coachella
6 Valley. As a result, both the GPU and CULM scenarios show that development
7 footprints would increase over the watersheds and groundwater basins in the
8 Coachella Valley. Their extent would be slightly less extensive than the current
9 General Plan (CURR scenario) everywhere outside of the Coachella Valley.
10 Nevertheless, for all of the groundwater basins associated with increasing
11 development footprints, the growth associated with any of the General Plan build out
12 scenarios would be cumulatively considerable if imported water supplies are limited
13 or unavailable in these areas.

14 Unavailability or unpredictability of imported water supplies, overdraft of
15 groundwater basins, increasing demand due to growth in Riverside County, as well as
16 environmental factors, such as climate change effects and drought, all play roles in
17 limiting the availability of water within Riverside County. As mentioned above, in
18 some remote locations, particularly in the far eastern desert beyond the Coachella
19 Valley and the region south of the San Jacinto Mountains between Anza and Coachella
20 Valley, lack of groundwater and lack of delivery infrastructure also are limiting factors.
21 For all of these reasons, the cumulative effects on water supply would be significant
22 and unavoidable at this time.

23 In attempting to meet the increased demand for water outlined above, future
24 development from any General Plan buildout scenario would incrementally increase
25 use of local groundwater supplies, both by water districts and individual landowners
26 through private pumps. This is particularly likely in areas of the County without
27 municipal water service or other access to imported water supplies or where new
28 development would rely solely on groundwater for supply. Compliance with

1 abovementioned existing laws, federal, State and County regulatory programs,
2 General Plan policies and the existing mitigation measures from EIR No. 441 described
3 below would not fully reduce the significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to
4 groundwater, as increased development will incrementally increase the impermeable
5 surfaces in Riverside County and interfere with groundwater recharge. Refer to the
6 "Project Impacts" section of this document for a full discussion of the regulatory
7 programs, policies, and mitigation measures that would be applied to this impact.
8 Where increased groundwater pumping exceeds the rate of basin recharge, it would
9 cumulatively result in the substantial depletion of groundwater in the County.

10 Cumulative Mitigation:

11 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.1C, 4.17.1D and 4.17.1E, listed under Impact
12 4.19.A, above, and Existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.2A and 4.17.2B, also above,
13 would reduce cumulative impacts to groundwater supply and recharge, however, not
14 to a less than significant level. While mitigation would reduce or minimize impacts to
15 groundwater supply and recharge, impacts to groundwater and groundwater
16 recharge would remain significant and unavoidable for the reasons described herein.

17 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-189 and 5-195

18 3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.19.H) Substantially Alter Existing Drainage Patterns
19 Resulting in Substantial Erosion or Siltation

20 The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) organizes the state into ten
21 major surface water drainage regions, two of which (the South Coast Region and the
22 Colorado River Region) include portions of Riverside County. Generally, the western
23 one-third of Riverside County lies within the South Coast Region, west of the San
24 Jacinto Mountains, and the eastern two-thirds of Riverside County lie within the
25 Colorado River Region. Designated watershed areas are included within each region,
26 several of which partially lie within Riverside County. Figure 4.19.3 in Section 4.19,
27 "Water Resources" in EIR No. 521 shows the major watersheds as they fall within
28

1 Riverside County. Additional information about the existing hydrological conditions in
2 these watersheds is provided in Section 4.19.2 in EIR No. 521.

3 Increased development resulting from General Plan implementation would also
4 incrementally reduce the distribution and extent of permeable surfaces suitable for
5 recharge. It may also increase runoff and subsequent flow in streams, and increase
6 the amount of non-point source pollutants that enter watercourses and recharge
7 areas. Development activities may also result in the incremental alteration or
8 elimination of features essential to local or regional hydrologic systems, or the
9 interruption of hydrologic processes leading to cumulatively considerable impacts.

10 Therefore, cumulative development could substantially alter existing drainage
11 patterns, resulting in substantial erosion or siltation. Even with compliance of key
12 regulations and programs provided above in the "Project Impacts" section of this
13 document, as well as on pages 5-192 and 5-193 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521, and the
14 implementation of the mitigation measures described below, cumulative impacts to
15 existing hydrology would remain cumulatively considerable, and would not be
16 reduced to a less than significant level.

17 Cumulative Mitigation:

18 In addition to the below specific mitigation measures from EIR No. 441 that address
19 drainage patterns and erosion directly, existing Mitigation Measures 4.17.5B and
20 4.17.5D, 4.17.5E and 4.9.1D, described in earlier sections of these findings, would also
21 aid in reducing impacts on existing drainage patterns, erosion and siltation. However,
22 cumulative impacts would not be reduced to a less than significant level.

23 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.4A states, "Where development may interfere with,
24 disrupt, or otherwise affect surface or subsurface hydrologic baseline conditions (as
25 determined by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District,
26 the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the California Department of Fish and
27 Wildlife, and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board), preparation of a project-
28 specific hydrologic study shall be required. The hydrologic study shall include (but

1 shall not be limited to): an inventory of surface and subsurface hydrologic conditions
2 existing at the time of the study; an analysis of how the proposed development would
3 affect these hydrologic baseline conditions; and specific measures to limit or eliminate
4 the interference or disruption of the onsite hydrologic process. The hydrologic study
5 shall evaluate the feasibility of incorporating bioengineering measures into any
6 project that may alter the hydrologic process. Where required by the County, the
7 hydrologic study shall include analysis of, at an equal level of detail, potential impacts
8 to tributary or downstream areas. The hydrologic study shall be submitted to the
9 County or responsible entity for review and shall be approved prior to the issuance of
10 any entitlement that would result in the physical modification of the project site."

11 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.4B states, "The project applicant shall submit to the
12 County for review and approval, evidence that the specific measures to limit or
13 eliminate the disruption or interference to the hydrologic process resulting from the
14 entire development process, will be implemented as set forth in the hydrologic study.
15 Such evidence may take the form of (but shall not be limited to): a development
16 agreement; land banking; the provision of adequate funds to guarantee the
17 construction, maintenance or restoration of hydrologic features; or any other
18 mechanism that will achieve said goals. Said evidence shall be submitted and
19 approved prior to the issuance of any entitlement that would result in the physical
20 modification of the project site."

21 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.4C states, "Bioengineering measures shall be
22 incorporated into any project that may alter the hydrologic process, where
23 determined feasible by the County or responsible entity."

24 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.9.1C states, "The County shall not necessarily require all
25 land uses to withstand flooding. These may include land uses such as agricultural, golf
26 courses, and trails. For these land uses, flows shall not be obstructed, and upstream
27 and downstream properties shall not be adversely affected by increased velocities,
28

1 erosion backwater effects, concentration of flows, and adverse impacts to water
2 quality from point and nonpoint sources of pollution.”

3 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.9.2C states, “Riverside County shall require that for
4 agricultural, recreation or other low-density uses, flows are not obstructed and that
5 upstream and downstream properties are not adversely affected by increased
6 velocities, erosion backwater effects or concentration of flows.”

7 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.10.9A states, “Riverside County, where required, and in
8 accordance with issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
9 (NPDES) permit, shall require the construction and/or grading contractor for
10 individual developments to establish and implement specific Best Management
11 Practices (BMPs) at time of project implementation.”

12 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.10.9B states, “Prior to any development within the
13 County, a grading plan shall be submitted to the Riverside County Building and Safety
14 Department and/or Riverside County Geologist for review and approval. As required
15 by the County, the grading plan shall include erosion and sediment control plans.
16 Measures included in individual erosion control plans may include, but shall not be
17 limited to, the following:

- 18 • Grading and development plans shall be designed in a manner which
19 minimizes the amount of terrain modification.
- 20 • Surface water shall be controlled and diverted around potential landslide
21 areas to prevent erosion and saturation of slopes.
- 22 • Structures shall not be sited on or below identified landslides unless slides are
23 stabilized.
- 24 • The extent and duration of ground disturbing activities during and
25 immediately following periods of rain shall be limited, to avoid the potential
26 for erosion which may be accelerated by rainfall on exposed soils.
- 27 • To the extent possible, the amount of cut and fill shall be balanced.
- 28

- The amount of water entering and exiting a graded site shall be limited through placement of interceptor trenches or other erosion control devices.
- Erosion and sediment control plans shall be submitted to the County [of Riverside] for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits."

Existing Mitigation Measure 4.10.9C states, "Drainage design measures shall be incorporated into the final design of individual projects onsite, where required. These measures shall include, but will not be limited to:

- Runoff entering developing areas shall be collected into surface and subsurface drains for removal to nearby drainages.
- Runoff generated above steep slopes or poorly vegetated areas shall be captured and conveyed to nearby drainages.
- Runoff generated on paved or covered areas shall be conveyed via swales and drains to natural drainage courses.
- Disturbed areas that have been identified as highly erosive shall be (re)vegetated.
- Irrigation systems shall be designed, installed and maintained in a manner which minimizes runoff.
- The landscape scheme for projects within the project site shall utilize drought-tolerant plants.

Erosion control devices such as rip-rap, gabions, small check dams, etc., may be utilized in gullies and active stream channels to reduce erosion."

As mentioned previously, implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce cumulative impacts, but not to a less than significant level.

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-181, 5-190 and 5-192 through 5-198

4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.19.I) Cause Runoff Exceeding Stormwater Drainage System Capacity or Cause Substantial Water Pollution

Buildout of any of the General Plan scenarios would result in the incremental development of vacant lands within Riverside County. The addition of impervious

1 surfaces from such development would incrementally increase stormwater runoff
2 within the affected watersheds. In some areas, existing drainage facilities may not be
3 adequate to accommodate the increase, leading to cumulatively significant impacts to
4 existing stormwater drainage facilities or triggering the need for new facilities.

5 New land uses would incrementally increase the amount of stormwater runoff due to
6 the increase in impermeable surfaces. This would also increase the amount of
7 pollutants conveyed to groundwater basins and surface waters in creeks and rivers.
8 The extensive stormwater management measures required by the County of Riverside
9 would reduce urban runoff impacts from new development. However, where existing
10 storm drainage facilities are inadequate or, in particular, where no regional storm
11 drain infrastructure exists (e.g., in wildland and fringe areas), incremental increases in
12 runoff would result in cumulatively significant impacts. Even with the implementation
13 of the abovementioned federal, State, and County regulatory programs, existing laws,
14 ordinances, and General Plan policies listed on pages 4.19-332 through 4.19-336 of
15 Section 4.19, "*Water Resources*" of EIR No. 521, and the implementation of all feasible
16 mitigation, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

17 Cumulative Mitigation:

18 Existing Mitigation Measures 4.9.2C, 4.10.9A, 4.10.9B, 4.10.9C, and 4.17.5B, described
19 in previous sections of these findings, would also aid in reducing cumulative impacts
20 due to runoff. In addition, the measures described below would also help reduce this
21 impact; however, as discussed above, cumulative impacts would remain significant
22 and unavoidable, even with implementation of mitigation.

23 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.17.5E states, "For each new development project, the
24 following principles and policies shall be considered and implemented:

- 25 a. Avoid or limit disturbance to natural water bodies and drainage systems (including
26 ephemeral drainage systems) when feasible. Provide adequate buffers of native
27 vegetation along drainage systems to lessen erosion and protect water quality.
28

- 1 b. Appropriate best management practices (BMPs) must be implemented to lessen
2 impacts to waters of the United States and/or waters of the State of California
3 resulting from development. Drainages should be left in a natural condition or
4 modified in a way that preserves all existing water quality standards where
5 feasible. Any discharges of sediment or other wastes, including wastewater, to
6 Waters of the United States or Waters of the State must be avoided to the
7 maximum extent practicable. All such discharges will require an NPDES permit
8 issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).
- 9 c. Small drainages shall be preserved and incorporated into new development, along
10 with adequate buffer zones of native vegetation, to the maximum extent
11 practicable.
- 12 d. Any impacts to waters of the United States require a Section 401 Water Quality
13 Standards Certification from the RWQCB. Impacts to these waters shall be avoided
14 to the maximum extent practicable. Where avoidance is not practicable, impacts
15 to these waters shall be minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Mitigation
16 of unavoidable impacts must, at a minimum, replace the full function and value of
17 the affected water body. Impacts to waters of the United States also require a
18 Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit from the United States Army Corps of
19 Engineers and a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department
20 of Fish and Wildlife.
- 21 e. The County shall encourage the use of pervious materials in development to
22 retain absorption and allow more percolation of stormwater into the ground. The
23 use of pervious materials, such as grass, permeable/porous pavement, etc., for
24 runoff channels and parking areas shall also be encouraged. Lining runoff channels
25 with impermeable surfaces, such as concrete or grouted riprap, will be
26 discouraged.
- 27 f. The County shall encourage construction of detention basins or holding ponds
28 and/or constructed wetlands within a project site to capture and treat dry

1 weather urban runoff and the first flush of rainfall runoff. These basins should be
2 designed to detain runoff for a minimum time, such as 24 hours, to allow particles
3 and associated pollutants to settle and to provide for natural treatment.

- 4 g. The County shall encourage development to retain areas of open space as natural
5 or landscaped to aid in the recharge and retention of runoff. Native plant
6 materials shall be used in replanting and hydroseeding operations, where feasible.
- 7 h. The County shall require that environmental documents for proposed projects in
8 areas tributary to Canyon Lake Reservoir, Lake Elsinore, sections of the Santa Ana
9 River, Fulmar Lake, and Mill Creek (as a result of the proposed 2002 303 (d) listing
10 of these waterbodies) include discharge prohibitions, revisions to discharge
11 permits, or management plans to address water quality impacts in accordance
12 with the controls that may be applied pursuant to state and federal regulation.
13 Environmental documents shall acknowledge that additional requirements may be
14 imposed in the future for projects in areas tributary to the water bodies listed
15 above.
- 16 i. The County shall ensure that in new development, post-development stormwater
17 runoff flow rates do not differ from the pre-development stormwater runoff flow
18 rates.
- 19 j. All construction projects should be designed and implemented to protect, and if at
20 all possible, to improve the quality of the underlying groundwater.
- 21 k. The County shall encourage the enhancement of groundwater recharge wherever
22 possible. Measures such as keeping stream/river channels and floodplains in
23 natural conditions or with pervious surfaces, as well as keeping areas of high
24 recharge as open space will be considered.
- 25 l. The County shall prohibit the discharge of waste material resulting from any type
26 of construction into any drainage areas, channels, streambeds, streams, lakes,
27 wetlands or rivers. Spoil sites shall be prohibited within any streams or areas
28 where spoil material could be washed into a water body.

1 m. The County shall require that appropriate BMPs be developed and implemented
2 during construction efforts to control the discharge of pollutants, prevent sewage
3 spills, and to avoid discharge of sediments into the streets, stormwater
4 conveyance channels or waterways.”

5 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.9.1.D states, “The County shall require the 10-year
6 flood flows to be contained within the top of curbs and the 100-year flood flows
7 within the street rights-of-way.”

8 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-190 and 5-194 through 5-198

9 5. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.19.J) Cause Significant Adverse Effects Due to the Need for
10 New or Expanded Stormwater Drainage Facilities

11 Refer to discussion in Cumulative Impact 4.19.I, above. Cumulative General Plan
12 buildout would result in the need for new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities,
13 and impacts would be cumulatively considerable, even with implementation of the
14 abovementioned existing federal, State and County regulations, laws, ordinances,
15 General Plan policies, and all feasible mitigation.

16 Cumulative Mitigation:

17 Mitigation Measures 4.17.5D, 4.17.5E, 4.10.9A, 4.10.9B, 4.10.9C, 4.17.4A, 4.17.4B and
18 4.17.4C, described in previous sections of these findings, would also aid in reducing
19 impacts due to the need for new or expanded storm drain facilities.

20 Existing Mitigation Measure 4.9.1.D states, “The County [of Riverside] shall require
21 the 10-year flood flows to be contained within the top of curbs and the 100-year flood
22 flows within the street rights-of-way.”

23 These measures would help reduce cumulative impacts related to the need for new or
24 expanded stormwater drainage facilities; however, the measures would reduce
25 cumulative impacts to a less than significant level. Cumulative impacts would remain
26 significant and unavoidable.

27 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 pages 5-190 and 5-194 through 5-198
28

1 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered the following
2 alternatives identified in EIR No. 521 in light of the environmental impacts which cannot be avoided or
3 substantially lessened and has rejected those alternatives as failing to meet most of the Project's
4 objectives, as failing to reduce or avoid the Project's significant impacts or as infeasible for the reasons
5 hereinafter stated:

6 A. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21002 and the State CEQA Guidelines section
7 15126.6(a), an EIR must assess a reasonable range of alternatives to the project action or
8 location. Section 15126.6(a) places emphasis on focusing the discussion on alternatives which
9 provide opportunities for eliminating any significant adverse environmental impacts, or
10 reducing them to a level of insignificance, even if these alternative would impede to some
11 degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly. In this regard, the
12 EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. As
13 with cumulative impacts, the discussion of alternatives is governed by the "rule of reason".
14 The EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained, or
15 does not contribute to an informed decision-making and public participation process. The
16 range of alternatives is defined by those alternatives, which could feasibly attain the
17 objectives of the project. As directed, in State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(c), an EIR
18 shall include alternatives to the project that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic
19 objectives of the project.

20 B. The Project has been developed to achieve the following goals:

- 21 1. Assess General Plan progress and issues related to its implementation: Ensure that the
22 General Plan continues to provide a clear and consistent set of directions for
23 implementing the Riverside County Vision throughout Riverside County over the next five
24 to ten years and into the future (2035 and beyond).
- 25 2. Initiate necessary changes among Foundation Components within the General Plan:
26 Ensure that the land use direction and planned intensities remain appropriate for their
27 given locations. Likewise, ensure that Policy Areas, Study Areas and Overlays throughout
28

1 Riverside County continue to plan for coordinated development at appropriate intensities
2 in the manner envisioned in the General Plan.

- 3 3. Develop policy, entitlement and technical amendments, as warranted: Update or correct
4 mapping items in the General Plan found to be inconsistent or inappropriate. Ensure that
5 resource maps and other data-based information in the General Plan accurately reflect
6 current data. Update the General Plan to accurately reflect current statutes, regulations
7 and policies of the County of Riverside and applicable outside agencies. Update General
8 Plan policies where necessary to reflect these items and to provide additional guidance
9 where found to be necessary.
- 10 4. Update future projections: Extend planning projections another five to ten years into the
11 future and adjust the General Plan to accommodate previously unanticipated needs.
- 12 5. Reassess the General Plan's Vision and Planning Principles: Recommit to and further the
13 General Plan Vision and Planning Principles through the addition of policies and plans that
14 expand upon them.

15 C. Accordingly, the following criteria were used to ascertain if a proposed alternative sufficiently
16 addressed the objective listed.

- 17 1. Further Progress: An alternative would successfully meet this objective if it ensures the
18 General Plan remains suitable as a plan for the coordination of future growth within
19 Riverside County (for example, provides additional policies and plans, such as new Rural
20 Village Overlays, where warranted to appropriately handle emerging growth patterns).
- 21 2. Update Land Use: An alternative would successfully meet this objective if it provides
22 updates to land use designations and Foundational components where necessary to
23 ensure that the General Plan remains suitable as a plan for the coordination of future
24 growth within Riverside County (for example, change mapped land use designations
25 [LUDs] and Foundations where warranted to appropriately handle emerging growth
26 patterns).
- 27 3. Update Technical Data: An alternative would successfully meet this objective if it provides
28 updates to General Plan's technical information (e.g., resource mapping, regulations,

demographics and statistics, etc.) where necessary to ensure that the General Plan continues to accurately reflect the current environmental, regulatory, socioeconomic and development status of Riverside County (for example, updating General Plan maps to reflect newly released mineral data from the State of California and adding a forest resources map to better coordinate with new CEQA policies addressing forest resources).

4. Address New Needs: An alternative would successfully meet this objective if it provides updates to the General Plan that enable it to appropriately plan, coordinate and implement new policies and programs necessitated by regulatory changes or by previously unanticipated needs (for example, adding greenhouse gas and climate change policies to the General Plan Air Quality Element in response to California State directives aimed at reducing carbon emissions).

5. Further County Vision: An alternative would successfully meet this objective if the changes it proposes serve to enhance and extend the continued progress of the General Plan in achieving the long-range goals established in the Riverside County Vision (for example, the addition of the "Healthy Communities" Element to the General Plan to encourage healthy living enabled by appropriate patterns of development).

As directed in State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(c), an EIR shall include alternatives to the project that could avoid or substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects. Because not all significant effects can be substantially reduced to a less than significant level either by adoption of mitigation measures, Project Design Features, existing regulations or by standard conditions of approval, the following section considers the feasibility of the Project alternatives as compared to the proposed Project. As explained below, these findings describe and reject, for reasons documented in the Final Program EIR No. 521 and summarized below, each one of the Project alternatives. The evidence supporting these findings is presented in Section 6.0, "Alternatives Analysis" of the Draft EIR and elsewhere in the administrative record as a whole.

A. Added Community Centers Alternative

1. The Added Community Centers Alternative addresses the effects of growth and development pressure by proposing to transfer development intensity planned for lands

1 identified for future open space conservation into a series of additional community
2 centers along transportation corridors. The overall number of residential units projected
3 for unincorporated Riverside County would remain the same, but their locations, and
4 possibly their densities, would change.

- 5 2. Overall, the shifting of open space-rural land uses to high density residential and retail-
6 commercial uses in the proposed community centers under this alternative serves a
7 number of complimentary purposes. Even though open space conservation is increased
8 greatly (by over 1 million acres), with the increase in urban uses, this alternative would
9 yield an increase of nearly 7,000 dwelling units and over 90,000 jobs, plus a population
10 increase of roughly 12,600 people as compared to buildout under the General Plan as
11 amended per the Project. Compared to the existing General Plan, population and dwelling
12 units both decrease (by 12,100 and 3,700, respectively) and jobs increase by only 56,000.

13 As a result of these changes, future development would be focused within existing and
14 burgeoning community centers along existing major transportation routes. The footprint
15 of new development within the open space and interface/wildland areas of Riverside
16 County would be greatly reduced (by roughly 80%). The reduced footprint in these rural
17 and open areas would better focus suburban and urban development in areas mapped
18 and already planned for such uses, both within County unincorporated areas as well as in
19 cities.

- 20 3. This alternative would have a number of significant environmental effects (either
21 individual, in localized areas, or cumulative). Certain of these significant environmental
22 effects would be substantially worse than those associated with the Project-updated
23 General Plan. These effects include:

- 24 a. Greenhouse gas emissions.
25 b. Increased use of existing parks and recreational facilities.
26 c. Growth effects resulting in the need for new or expanded parks or recreational
27 facilities.
28 d. Circulation system effectiveness and congestion management conflicts.

1 e. Increased traffic levels in localized areas.

2 4. In terms of the Project's stated objectives, this alternative would satisfy all but one. It
3 would provide a suitable plan for "further progress" within Riverside County, since it
4 provides for additional urban development in Riverside County. It would provide updated
5 technical data, simply by definition. It also would address the updated regulatory
6 environment that future development within Riverside County would need to comply
7 with (e.g., AB 32 and greenhouse gas reduction planning) for similar reasons, even though
8 it would require additional CAP measures to reduce to the additional greenhouse gas
9 emissions associated with this alternative. Nevertheless, it could still be said to
10 adequately meet the "address new needs" objective. It also may further the Riverside
11 County Vision by allowing higher growth in certain urban cores, extending or enhancing
12 "continued progress" within Riverside County. The only objective not met is that it does
13 not include any LUD updates, and thus does not address the "updated land use"
14 objective.

15 5. Although its overall development footprint is smaller, this alternative would result in a
16 small (roughly 1%) increase in both people and homes within the urban areas of Riverside
17 County and a larger increase (16%) in jobs associated with the commercial uses added in
18 the additional community centers. As such, this alternative's growth-inducing effects
19 would also be slightly higher than those of the proposed Project. Akin to those of the
20 Project, most of this alternative's growth-inducing impacts, both individually and
21 cumulatively, would be significant and unavoidable. This alternative would foster direct
22 and indirect population growth and economic growth; it would also facilitate construction
23 of additional housing. It does not, however, address existing Rural Village Study Areas
24 (RVSA's) and Rural Village Overlays. Thus, this alternative does not remove the substantial
25 obstacles growth that has arisen in the existing General Plan due to lack of detailed
26 planning for these RVSA's. This alternative would, however, have substantially less
27 impacts than Project buildout in terms of facilitation of additional environmental impacts,
28 specifically those due to encroachment into isolated or remote areas, due to the greatly

1 reduced footprint within rural, interface and wildland areas. In total, all of the growth
2 inducement impacts outlined in Section 5.4, "*Growth Inducement*" in EIR No. 521 (pages
3 5-29 through 5-42), except Impact 5.4.E, were found to be individually and cumulatively
4 significant for this alternative.

- 5 6. The Added Community Centers Alternative would enable increased growth in urban cores
6 while lessening some of the significant effects associated with the proposed Project. It
7 addresses nearly all of the significant environmental impacts identified for the Project and
8 greatly reduces a number of effects, particularly spatial impacts, as a result of the
9 reduced development footprint.

10 Some, but not all, of the Project's significant cumulative impacts are lessened under this
11 alternative; however these effects are offset by the localized increases that would result
12 within the urbanized Community Centers proposed. Specifically, due to the increase in
13 housing, population, jobs, traffic and associated economic activity, this alternative would
14 result in substantial individual and/or cumulative impacts in a number of areas, including
15 greenhouse gas emissions and traffic congestion. Also, because of the disproportionate
16 effects of growth in urban areas, this alternative would also have substantially greater
17 impacts on existing parks and recreational facilities and cause growth effects triggering
18 the need for additional facilities. It would also have growth-inducing effects on Riverside
19 County, its cities and the surrounding communities, cities and counties. In all other areas,
20 significant impacts either individually or cumulatively would be generally similar to those
21 associated with buildout of the General Plan pursuant to the Project, GPA No. 960.

22 Taken together, this alternative addresses six of the seven areas of significant effects
23 associated with the proposed Project. However, it only substantially lessens or avoids
24 significant impacts for one of the seven (agriculture); for air quality, noise and growth
25 inducement, this alternative's impacts are generally similar to those of the Project.
26 Although an improvement in many ways over the Project, because of the absolute
27 limiting effect of the finite water supply availability, this alternative will cause an increase
28

1 in greenhouse gas emissions and traffic congestion. For these reasons, this alternative
2 was not deemed the environmentally superior alternative.

3 Further, although this alternative meets four of the five objectives of the Project, it does
4 so while increasing growth and localized urban impacts beyond that of the proposed
5 Project or existing General Plan. Thus, this alternative is not deemed the favored means
6 for achieving the stated Project objectives and, for these reasons, the Added Community
7 Centers Alternative is not deemed the preferred alternative.

8 **B. Agricultural Emphasis Alternative**

- 9 1. The Agricultural Emphasis Alternative addresses the effects of development pressure on
10 agricultural resources by proposing a scenario in which removal of land from the
11 Agricultural Foundation would only be allowed every eight years. Within the Eastern
12 Coachella Valley Area Plan, future conversions would be limited to 50% of the proposed
13 site; the remainder of the site would be required to be placed into permanent agricultural
14 easements.
- 15 2. The shifting of open space-rural land uses to agriculture and conserved open proposed
16 under this alternative serves a number of complimentary purposes. Even though open
17 space conservation is increased greatly, with the increase in agricultural uses, this
18 alternative would yield an increase of nearly 9,000 dwelling units and over 44,000 jobs,
19 plus a population increase of 19,000 people as compared to buildout under the updated
20 General Plan. It does so by expanding the agricultural footprint of Riverside County and
21 slightly increasing the average densities of the developed (urban and suburban) portions
22 of unincorporated Riverside County. (From an average density of 1.8 to 2.0 dwelling unit
23 per acre [du/ac] for single-family residential uses and from 8.3 to 8.7 du/ac for multi-
24 family residential.) The restriction on Agriculture Foundation conversion would focus
25 suburban and urban development in areas mapped and already planned for such uses,
26 both within Riverside County unincorporated areas as well as in cities.
- 27 3. This alternative would have a number of significant environmental effects (either
28 individual, in localized areas or cumulative). Certain of these significant environmental

1 effects would be substantially worse than those associated with the Project-updated
2 General Plan. These effects include:

- 3 a. Induce direct or indirect population growth (within the urban areas benefitting from
4 rural density transfers).
- 5 b. Increase greenhouse gas emissions.
- 6 c. Increase demand for energy (electricity and natural gas).
- 7 d. Increase demand for water supplies, both imported and groundwater.
- 8 e. Cause significant environmental impacts due to the construction of additional
9 infrastructure needed to harvest and/or deliver additional water to meet demand.

10 4. In terms of the Project's stated objectives, this alternative does not satisfy several
11 objectives. It would not provide a suitable plan for further progress within Riverside
12 County since it does not update the study areas identified in 2003 for future planning
13 specifications. It does not include any LUD updates and thus does not address the
14 updated land use objective. It would provide updated technical data, simply by definition.
15 It also would address the updated regulatory environment that future development
16 within Riverside County would need to comply with (e.g., AB 32 and greenhouse gas
17 reduction planning) for similar reasons. It would not, however, fully comply with AB 32
18 due to the substantial increase in greenhouse gas emissions associated with this
19 alternative. Nevertheless, in all, this alternative could be said to adequately meet the
20 "address new needs" objective. It does not, however, further the Riverside County Vision
21 in regards to growth since the restrictions on agricultural conversion would significantly
22 hinder (not "enhance" or "extend") "continued progress" within Riverside County.

23 5. With its slightly larger urban development potential and slightly smaller rural residential
24 footprint, the Agricultural Emphasis Alternative would accommodate a slightly higher
25 number of homes, population and workforce than the proposed Project. As such, this
26 alternative's growth-inducing effects would also be slightly higher than those of the
27 Project. Akin to those of the Project, most of this alternative's growth-inducing impacts
28 would be significant and unavoidable. This alternative would foster direct and indirect

1 population growth and economic growth. It would also facilitate the construction of
2 additional housing. It does not, however, address (update) existing Rural Village Study
3 Areas (RVSA) or Rural Village Overlays. As such, this alternative would not remove the
4 obstacles to growth that have arisen in the existing General Plan due to lack of detailed
5 planning for the RVSA. And, in fact, by requiring an eight-year window for all Agriculture
6 Foundation LUD changes (except those within ECVAP), this alternative would actually
7 create additional growth inhibitors within Riverside County.

- 8 6. The Agricultural Emphasis Alternative would cause slightly more significant environmental
9 impacts in the growing urban and suburban portions of unincorporated Riverside County,
10 while substantially reducing many (but not all) impacts associated with spatial effects in
11 the rural portions of Riverside County. In several key areas, this alternative would avoid,
12 minimize or reduce impacts found significant under the proposed Project to less than
13 significant levels. These include: conversion of state-designated farmlands and
14 encroachment or conflicts with existing agricultural uses; exposure of people or
15 structures to wildland fire risks; and, facilitation of environmental effects due to the
16 encroachment of development into isolated or remote areas.

17 With its greatly reduced rural development footprint, it would also avoid cumulatively
18 significant cumulative impacts to archeological and paleontological resources, hazards
19 (particularly in interface and wildland areas), demand for fire protection services and
20 effects on water resources and groundwater basins. The smaller development footprint
21 means cumulative effects on existing hydrology and stormwater drainage systems would
22 also be less than significant. This alternative would also avoid significant growth-inducing
23 effects resulting from facilitating encroachment into isolated or remote areas. However,
24 because this alternative restricts agricultural conversion, it would hinder (reduce)
25 significant growth-inducing effects by creating (rather than removing) obstacles to
26 population growth within Riverside County.

27 Lastly, this alternative would also result in several substantially greater (worse)
28 environmental impacts, including: greatly increased demand for water, both imported

1 and local (groundwater); increased demand for energy (electricity and natural gas) due
2 mainly to increased agricultural uses (particularly water pumping) and related economic
3 uses (dairies, commercial, industrial, etc.); and increased energy use and increased off-
4 road equipment and vehicle operations associated with agricultural uses, contributing to
5 substantial cumulative greenhouse gas emissions; and lastly, environmental impacts
6 associated with the need for new or expanded water infrastructure. Except for the
7 greenhouse gas emissions, however, none of these cumulatively significant impacts are
8 new as compared to those of the Project-updated General Plan.

9 Taken together, this alternative adequately addresses four of the seven areas of
10 significant effects associated with the proposed Project, including having substantial
11 improvements over the Project in terms of both agricultural impacts and on-road vehicle
12 traffic levels. It would also, however, be associated with three areas of more severe,
13 environmental impacts, including increased water demand and increased cumulative
14 impacts in several areas. Although an improvement over the Project in some ways, this
15 alternative would not be the environmentally superior alternative due to the severe
16 limitations and significant environmental impacts that would result in conjunction with
17 the greatly increased water demand under this alternative. For these reasons, this
18 alternative was not deemed the environmentally superior alternative.

19 Further, as outlined above, this alternative only meets two of five of the objectives of the
20 Project. Thus, this alternative is not an acceptable means for achieving the stated Project
21 objectives. For all of these reasons, the Agricultural Emphasis Alternative is not deemed
22 the preferred alternative.

23 C. Reduced Rural Villages Alternative

- 24 1. The Reduced Rural Villages Alternative would be similar to the changes to Rural Village
25 Overlays (RVOs) proposed under GPA No. 960 in terms of eliminating RVO study areas
26 (RVOSAs). However, it would also include additional reductions in development potential
27 through the deletion of the two new RVOs proposed as part of GPA No. 960. Specifically,
28 both the existing "Study Area" designations and the proposed new RVOs for the Good

1 Hope and Meadowbrook areas would be deleted. Land uses would remain in their
2 existing LUDs, with no alternative development potential added through the RVO overlay
3 function. Unlike GPA No. 960, it would also omit several Policy Areas (either existing or
4 proposed under GPA No. 960) that provide for future urbanization within specific areas,
5 including in Anza in the hills of southern Riverside County and the Vista Santa Rosa region
6 in the Coachella Valley, among others.

- 7 2. The reductions in development potential (residential densities and economic use
8 intensities) proposed under this alternative serve a number of complementary purposes.
9 The reduction in housing (11,400 fewer units than proposed for the existing General Plan)
10 would have a corresponding effect on Riverside County population, decreasing it by
11 37,000 people. Similarly, the reduced commercial and industrial uses proposed would
12 result in roughly 42,000 fewer jobs at buildout. This decrease in workers would yield
13 complementary decreases in vehicle miles traveled for commuters, reducing traffic
14 congestion and the associated effects on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and noise
15 levels. The decreased population would also lessen demand for and effects on public
16 services and facilities, such as schools, parks, etc. Unlike the Green Energy Alternative
17 (described immediately following this alternative), the Reduced Rural Villages
18 Alternative's population decreases would not be offset by other proposed increases
19 elsewhere in unincorporated Riverside County. Accordingly, this alternative does not
20 cause any impacts that would be substantially greater than those for buildout of either
21 the existing or updated General Plans.
- 22 3. The Reduced Rural Villages Alternative would generally have environmental effects within
23 unincorporated Riverside County similar to, but mostly less substantial than, those
24 forecast for buildout of either the existing General Plan or the General Plan as amended
25 per the Project. The fewer homes and employment-generating land uses proposed under
26 this alternative means that increases in both population and jobs would be reduced and,
27 with this the attendant environmental effects would be lessened as well. The reduced
28 population at buildout would mean fewer population-driven demands for increased

1 infrastructure, public services and facilities, such as parks, schools, post offices, hospitals,
2 etc. Fewer homes and jobs in Riverside County would also mean fewer trips within
3 Riverside County traveled by residents and commuters, resulting in lower VMT, less wear-
4 and-tear on roads and less congestion compared to the General Plan buildout scenarios.
5 It should be noted, however, that these effects would be slight compared to the proposed
6 Project, GPA No. 960, as this alternative's reduction in jobs and housing only average
7 about 1% each.

8 In terms of spatial impacts, this alternative proposed an overall development footprint
9 that is largely similar to that associated with the Project. The exception, however, is in
10 areas where RVOs and RVSA's are removed under this alternative (particularly in the
11 Aguanga and Anza regions in southwestern Riverside County). These areas would have
12 smaller development footprints with fewer attendant spatial environmental impacts. For
13 this reason, environmental impacts associated with spatial changes (i.e., those tied
14 directly to land itself and the resources on or in it) would generally be less significant
15 under this alternative. This includes all of the impacts associated with: forestry resources,
16 biological resources, including wildlife and its habitat, cultural resources, including
17 historical and archeological artifacts and sites, paleontological resources, flooding and
18 dam inundation hazards, hazards to or due to geology, soils or seismicity, including known
19 earthquake faults, liquefaction zones, expansive soils, etc., exposure to hazardous
20 materials and sites as a result of existing or past activities, and changes in hydrology,
21 drainage or groundwater runoff. Since the areas reduced are small portions of the overall
22 unincorporated Riverside County, the overall effect on the environment relative to these
23 areas would be large similar to those outlined for the proposed Project.

24 In addition, though minor in most cases, this alternative would nevertheless yield
25 decreased impacts across most of the environmental areas examined in this EIR,
26 particularly as compared to those associated with existing General Plan buildout. While
27 lowered, the overall levels of significance for most of these are roughly the same as those
28 predicted for the proposed Project. In only a few areas does this alternative differ from

1 the project; specifically, the reduced development potential to accommodate
2 urbanization means this alternative would be unlikely to result in cumulatively significant
3 inducement of population growth. In addition, the limits on urban population increases
4 (due to the removal of the RVOs) would also prevent cumulatively significant demands on
5 existing parks and recreational facilities.

6 This alternative was found to have overall higher impacts in two areas. First, its
7 encroachment effects on isolated and remote areas would likely be greater than the
8 Project's because of greater economic pressure to meet housing demands that could not
9 be provided in more urban areas (refer to Section 5.4, "*Growth Inducement*" in EIR No.
10 521, Impact 5.4.E). This effect would also be noticeable in the cities and in the counties
11 adjacent to Riverside County. Second, the reduced urbanization under this alternative
12 would remain a greater obstacle to growth (refer to Section 5.4, "*Growth Inducement*" in
13 EIR No. 521, Impact 5.4.D).

- 14 4. In terms of the Project's stated objectives, this alternative does adequately meet 60% of
15 them. It would provide LUD updates, and thus, address the updated land use objective. It
16 would also provide updated technical data, by definition, and would address the updated
17 regulatory environment that future development within Riverside County would need to
18 comply with (e.g., AB 32 and greenhouse gas reduction planning) for similar reasons.
19 Thus, it is would meet some of the objective for meeting new needs. It would not,
20 however, provide future planning necessary to address and accommodate the new needs
21 related to urbanizing growth pressures on rural areas located near urban fringes. As such,
22 it also would not accommodate further progress within Riverside County. Rather than
23 providing plans to handle future demand for urbanizing uses within unincorporated
24 Riverside County, this alternative actually limits further progress in terms of future
25 development necessary to meet population growth forecast for Riverside County.
26 Similarly, it also would not "further the County Vision," as its limits on urbanization in
27 growing rural-fringe areas would limit, rather than enhancing or extending, continued
28 progress within Riverside County.

1 5. With its slightly smaller development potential and footprint, the Reduced Rural Villages
2 Alternative would accommodate a slightly smaller resident population and workforce,
3 with an attendant reduction in the growth-inducing effects. As such, this alternative's
4 overall growth-inducing effects, both economic- and population-related, would be slightly
5 lower than the Project's within unincorporated Riverside County. The reduced population
6 growth expected would also slightly reduce the overall potential for strain on community
7 services and facilities, as compared to buildout of either the existing General Plan or the
8 amended plan as proposed by GPA No. 960.

9 In two areas, however, this alternative's impacts would be greater. First, rather than
10 removing obstacles to population growth, by limiting the potential for urbanization in key
11 rural areas, this alternative increased these obstacles. And, as a result, this limit would
12 increase pressure on rural areas to develop to provide the necessary housing stock
13 demanded in Riverside County. This pressure would also increase growth in non-county
14 jurisdictions as well. Thus, the result of this Project would be encroachment into the more
15 isolated and remote portions of Riverside County that would have otherwise seen limited
16 development pressure. With increased development in such areas there would be an
17 attendant increase in the potential for other activities leading to significant
18 environmental effects, for example, increased wildfire risks, increased pet predation,
19 human disturbance, increases in light and sound, and other wildland-interface fringe
20 effects. However, since the buildout of the General Plan pursuant to the Project would
21 also allow increased development in interface and wildland areas (as compared to the
22 existing General Plan), this alternative's impacts, while significant, are not considered
23 new.

24 6. The Reduced Rural Villages Alternative would likely cause slightly fewer significant
25 environmental impacts within the unincorporated portions of Riverside County as a result
26 of the small (1-4%) decrease in the number of houses, people, jobs and economic uses
27 proposed. These slight reductions mean that impacts associated with this alternative
28 would be largely the same or substantially similar to those forecast for buildout of the

1 General Plan as amended pursuant to the Project, GPA No. 960. Particularly as a result of
2 fewer vehicle miles traveled in Riverside County, impacts associated with traffic, noise
3 and air quality would be lower under this alternative. A lower population at buildout
4 would also mean that risks to people, such as from seismic, flood, air travel and
5 hazardous material use, for example, would be slightly lower. Impacts resulting from the
6 presence of people, such as demand for parks, schools, landfills, hospitals and other
7 public services, as well as for water, wastewater treatment, electricity, roads and other
8 infrastructure, would also be correspondingly reduced. In most cases, however,
9 incremental impacts in these areas would still be cumulatively substantial. Lastly, this
10 alternative does not adequately address significant adverse effects to agriculture because
11 the reduced potential for urbanizing development in key locations would contribute to an
12 increase in development within areas that would otherwise remain rural and
13 undeveloped, particularly within wildland and interface portions of Riverside County, nor
14 does it provide adequate plans for handling future urbanizing growth pressures and, as a
15 result, would tend to lead to sprawling growth within the rural portions of Riverside
16 County, particularly within the Rural Community Foundation.

17 In terms of environmental impacts, this alternative was found to "substantially lessen"
18 traffic impacts because of the reduced urban areas allowed. It was also found to
19 successfully address, though not "substantially lessen," impacts in six areas of significant
20 effects associated with the proposed Project. It was not found to cause any new
21 significant impacts or substantially increase any already expected to be significant
22 pursuant to Project analyses.

23 Although a slight improvement over the Project, because of the reduced urban
24 development accommodated under this alternative, it would induce significant growth
25 within cities and adjacent counties as a result of the unmet growth pressures within the
26 unincorporated areas. Nevertheless, notwithstanding these impacts outside
27 unincorporated Riverside County, this alternative does reduce, either slightly or
28 substantially, a majority of the significant adverse impacts associated with the Project

(i.e., buildout of the General Plan pursuant to GPA No. 960). For this reason, this alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative. However, because of the limitations on future urbanization inherent in this alternative, it only meets two of five of the project objectives (40%). For this reason, despite being environmentally favorable, this alternative would not be an acceptable means for achieving the stated Project objectives. Accordingly, the Reduced Rural Villages Alternative is not deemed the preferred alternative.

D. Green Economy Alternative

1. The Green Economy Alternative would entail revisions to the General Plan to encourage the development and utilization of the green (renewable) energy resources available in unincorporated Riverside County (e.g., wind, solar and geothermal). It would allow the transfer of development density/intensity from lands of high fire hazard into areas with alternative energy availability. The overall number of residential units and business uses (commercial and industrial) projected for unincorporated Riverside County would remain the same, but their locations, and possibly their densities, would change.
2. The shifting of open space-rural land uses to green energy, light industrial and conserved open space proposed under this alternative serves a number of complementary purposes. With the shift of housing to industrial uses, the unincorporated portion of Riverside County would offer roughly 15,400 fewer homes under this alternative as compared to buildout of the existing General Plan. This means nearly 60,000 fewer people would be accommodated as Riverside County residents, lessening the increases in demand for additional schools, parks and other public services. Despite this, the additional industrial uses could provide nearly a million additional jobs (904,500) at buildout of this alternative, if fully realized. Such an increase would greatly alter Riverside County's jobs-to-housing balance and shift workers from commuting out of Riverside County for jobs to commuting into Riverside County. This influx of workers, however, would come at a cost: increased vehicular traffic and increases in other vehicle-associated impacts, such as air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions, noise levels and wear-and-tear on roads.

- 1 3. This alternative would have a number of significant environmental effects (either
2 individual, in localized areas, or cumulative). Certain of these significant environmental
3 effects would be substantially worse than those associated with the project-updated
4 General Plan. These effects include:
- 5 a. Greenhouse gas emissions.
6 b. Circulation system effectiveness.
7 c. Increased traffic levels in localized areas.
8 d. Fostering of direct and indirect economic growth due to the large increase in available
9 jobs proposed.
- 10 4. In terms of the Project's stated objectives, this alternative appears to satisfy all of them. It
11 provides a suitable plan for further progress within Riverside County, particularly in terms
12 of increasing jobs availability. Even though it does not update the RVOSAs identified in
13 2003 for future planning specifications, it provides an alternate plan for future
14 development and would also provide LUD updates; thus, it does address the updated land
15 use objective. It would provide updated technical data, simply by definition. And, despite
16 increased greenhouse gas emissions, it would address the updated regulatory
17 environment that future development within Riverside County would need to comply
18 with (e.g., AB 32 and greenhouse gas reduction planning). Thus, it would adequately meet
19 the "address new needs" objective. Lastly, it would further the Riverside County Vision,
20 since it proposes to greatly increase jobs in the region, helping to balance a region that
21 traditionally has more homes than jobs, while preserving open space and the quality of
22 life for Riverside County residents. This new economy would serve to "enhance" and
23 "extend" the "continued progress" within Riverside County.
- 24 5. With its slightly smaller development potential and footprint, but larger overall industrial
25 uses, including a substantial increase in the area devoted to green energy generation, the
26 Green Economy Alternative would accommodate a slightly smaller resident population,
27 but a much larger workforce than the proposed Project. Thus, this alternative's overall
28 growth-inducing effects would be somewhat higher than the Project's. As with those for

1 General Plan buildout pursuant to the Project, most of this alternative's growth-inducing
2 impacts would be significant and unavoidable. It would foster direct and indirect
3 population growth. In particular, it would foster substantially greater levels of direct and
4 indirect economic growth as a result of the nearly one million additional jobs created. It
5 would also facilitate the construction of additional housing (presumably to supply
6 demand created by workers looking to reduce their commutes from outlying areas).

7 It does not, however, address existing Rural Village Study Areas (RVSA) and Rural Village
8 Overlays. Thus, this alternative does not remove the substantial obstacles to growth that
9 have arisen in the existing General Plan due to lack of detailed planning for these RVSA.
10 By reducing the development envelope allowed for OS-RUR in wildlands and interface
11 areas, it does, however, prevent growth that would cause additional significant
12 environmental effects through encroachment into these isolated and remote parts of
13 Riverside County. It also limits to some extent the extent of population growth that would
14 be expected, thus slightly reducing the overall potential for strain on community services
15 and facilities, as compared to buildout of either the existing General Plan or the amended
16 plan as proposed by GPA No. 960.

- 17 6. The Green Economy Alternative seeks to provide the planning needed to help California,
18 and the country, transition from the existing, petroleum-based economy to a new,
19 cleaner "Green Economy" based on alternative energy generation and related industries.
20 Despite the decreased reliance on fossil fuels, however, the analysis herein finds that this
21 alternative would have environmental impacts of similar severity to those forecast for
22 buildout of the General Plan as updated per GPA No. 960. In certain areas, in fact, this
23 alternative would have substantially greater significant impacts driven mostly by the large
24 increase in jobs created in Riverside County.

25 While it would reduce certain regional impacts (such as greenhouse gases and, possibly,
26 traffic congestion), it would do so at the expense of substantial increases in cumulative
27 environmental impacts within Riverside County itself. In particular, key areas adversely
28 affected are those associated with the increased number of commuters heading into

1 Riverside County for work: increased traffic and congestion (due to increased vehicle
2 miles traveled within the county), higher ambient noise levels (increased due to roadway
3 traffic noise), increased localized and regional air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.
4 This alternative would also result in specific new significant impacts to viewsheds and
5 aesthetics (including scenic highways) and to roadways and intersections in which the
6 additional traffic volumes cause LOS ranges to be exceeded above and beyond those
7 already identified by either the existing General Plan or for this proposed Project (i.e., in
8 Section 4.18, "*Transportation and Circulation*" of EIR No. 521). Lastly, even though not
9 new significant impacts, water-related impacts to domestic and groundwater supplies
10 would also be substantially greater under this alternative.

11 Taken together, this alternative only addresses four of the seven areas of significant
12 effects associated with the proposed Project. Although an improvement in many ways
13 over the Project, because of the increase in jobs and the improved jobs-to-housing
14 balance, this alternative has substantially greater adverse effects associated with this
15 greenhouse gases, traffic and aesthetics. Even though this alternative meets all of the
16 Project objectives, it does so at the expense of greater environmental effects. For all of
17 these reasons, this alternative would not be deemed the environmentally superior
18 alternative.

19 In summary, this alternative is not an acceptable means for achieving the stated Project
20 objectives and for all of the above reasons, the Green Economy Alternative is not deemed
21 the preferred alternative.

22 E. No Build/No Growth Alternative

- 23 1. The No Build/No Growth Alternative is one type of "no project" scenario addressed by
24 CEQA for comparison purposes. It would entail no growth occurring at all within
25 unincorporated Riverside County (i.e., the County of Riverside would not approve any
26 additional development applications). The only growth occurring in Riverside County
27 would be within its cities, which are assumed to buildout according to their General Plans.
28 As a result, the environmental baseline of Riverside County would be preserved in many

1 areas, except where adversely affected by the growing demands of the cities within
2 Riverside County (e.g., water use, traffic generation, land annexations, etc.).

3 2. For this alternative, with no additional development occurring in unincorporated
4 Riverside County, most of the environmental impacts within Riverside County would be
5 substantially less adverse than those of the proposed Project. In a few areas, such as
6 certain air quality impacts, seismic risks, noise exposure, traffic levels and stormwater
7 drainage needs, existing (baseline) environmental effects are already at a significant level
8 and this alternative would not relieve or lessen these impacts.

9 3. However, this alternative would have a number of significant environmental effects
10 (either individual, in localized areas or cumulative). Certain of these significant
11 environmental effects would be substantially worse than those associated with the
12 Project-updated General Plan. These effects include the following:

- 13 a. Greenhouse gas emissions and conflicts with regulatory compliance.
- 14 b. Inefficient use of energy.
- 15 c. Circulation system effectiveness and congestion management conflicts.
- 16 d. Increased traffic levels in localized areas.
- 17 e. Groundwater depletion or overdraft.
- 18 f. Population increase straining community services or facilities.
- 19 g. Facilitation of other activities leading to significant environmental effects (in
20 particular, increasing the rate of growth within the cities of Riverside County and
21 surrounding cities and counties).

22 4. In terms of the Project's stated objectives, this alternative does not satisfy several
23 objectives. It would not provide a suitable plan for "further progress" within Riverside
24 County since it posits no growth and no development. Nor would it address new needs,
25 since it pushes all new growth into the cities where Riverside County's General Plan does
26 not apply. It would provide updated technical data, simply by definition, but would not
27 provide any updated land uses within Riverside County (since no further development
28 would be permitted). And, most particularly, it does not further the Riverside County

Vision in any way since it does not permit or promote any “continued progress” within the County.

5. It is possible that under this alternative, increased growth pressure in the cities could lead to increased development above that currently planned. At present, the cities of Riverside County are projected to provide a total of approximately 1.04 million dwelling units at buildout (83% of the countywide total) with unincorporated Riverside County only providing roughly 207,000 more units. This would leave a housing deficit of over 520,000 homes within the unincorporated areas under this alternative. Notwithstanding the existing cities’ general plans, making up this half-million-plus deficit within the cities would require significant changes in city general plans and result in a number of additional significant impacts within the cities.
6. Overall, the No Build/No Growth Alternative would “substantially lessen” most of the significant environmental impacts within the unincorporated portions of Riverside County, as indicated in Table 6.4-B on pages 6.0-14 through 6.0-17 in EIR No. 521, Section 6.0, “*Alternatives Analysis*”. In a few areas under this alternative, however, a number of existing impacts would remain significant and would not be mitigated. These include: increased traffic network congestion and inadequate levels of service and groundwater depletion.

In addition, new impacts would arise where future conditions do not conform to regulatory conditions. In particular, these include: conflicts with greenhouse gas reduction plans (particularly AB 32 and the associated CARB Scoping Plan) and increasingly inefficient uses of energy (particularly electricity) as a result of failure to implement the CARB Scoping Plan, the proposed Climate Action Plan (CAP), new California State Title 24 energy efficiency standards, and other related plans.

Taken together, the substantial reduction in significant impacts associated with this alternative would make it appear to be the “environmentally superior” alternative addressed under CEQA. However, Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines

notes, "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project' alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives."

In addition, as outlined above, this alternative meets only one of five of the objectives of the Project. This means that this alternative is not an acceptable means for achieving the stated Project objectives. For all of these reasons, despite being found "environmentally superior" to the proposed Project, the No Build/No Growth Alternative is not deemed the preferred alternative.

F. No Project/Status Quo Alternative

1. The No Project/Status Quo Alternative is the key CEQA-mandated "no project" alternative called out in State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e). For this EIR, the scenario assumes that GPA No. 960 is not adopted and that the existing RCIP General Plan (adopted in October 2003, and as amended through 2010), remains the guiding document dictating future growth within unincorporated Riverside County. Accordingly, this alternative can also be said to represent the "status quo."
2. Because it does not include the reductions associated with GPA No. 960's proposed Rural Village Study Area changes, buildout under this alternative would generally result in slightly greater adverse environmental impacts than that associated with the Project. In particular, this alternative does not address new environmental concerns, such as greenhouse gas emissions, traffic (VMT) reductions, energy conservation or water conservation. In some areas, such as certain types of air pollution, noise exposure and traffic levels, existing (baseline) environmental effects are already at a significant level and the alternative would not relieve or lessen these impacts.
3. This alternative would have a number of significant environmental effects (either individual, in localized areas or cumulative). Certain of these significant environmental effects would be substantially worse than those associated with the Project-updated General Plan. These effects include:
 - a. Adverse effects to existing visual character, light and glare, and other aesthetic effects.

- b. Increased greenhouse gas emissions and conflicts with existing regulations seeking to reduce greenhouse gases.
 - c. Impacts to biota and sensitive biological resources in areas not covered by a MSCHP.
 - d. Inefficient use of energy.
 - e. Increased people and property exposed to excess noise.
 - f. Circulation system effectiveness and congestion management conflicts.
 - g. Increased demand on existing water supplies and need for additional water.
 - h. Groundwater depletion or overdraft.
 - i. Population increase straining community services or facilities.
 - j. Facilitation of other activities leading to significant environmental effects (in particular, increasing the rate of growth within the cities of Riverside County and surrounding cities and counties).
4. In terms of the Project's stated objectives, this alternative does not satisfy several objectives. It would not provide a suitable plan for further progress within Riverside County since it does not update the study areas identified in 2003 for future planning specifications. It does not include any LUD updates and thus does not address the updated land use objective. Since it does not address updated regulations that future development within Riverside County would need to comply with (e.g., AB 32 and greenhouse gas reduction planning), it does not satisfy the address new needs objective. It would provide updated technical data, simply by definition (this is the only Project objective that would be met by this alternative). Lastly, it does not further the Riverside County Vision in any way since it does not "enhance" or "extend" the "continued progress" within Riverside County.
5. With its slightly larger development potential and footprint, the No Project/Status Quo Alternative would accommodate a slightly larger population and workforce than the proposed Project. As such, this alternative's growth-inducing effects would also be slightly higher than the Project. Similar to that of the Project, most of this alternative's growth-inducing impacts would be significant and unavoidable. It would foster direct and indirect

1 population growth and economic growth. This would also facilitate the construction of
2 additional housing and lead to other significant environmental growth-related effects,
3 such as encroachment into isolated areas and increased human trespass into remote
4 areas.

- 5 6. The significant impacts within Riverside County associated with this alternative are
6 generally substantially similar to those anticipated for the proposed Project. This
7 alternative, however, proposes slightly higher levels of population, housing, workforce
8 and employment-generating land uses (roughly 2-6%). As such, even in instances where
9 both the Project and this alternative have similarly significant impacts, this alternative
10 would be slightly more severe than the Project.

11 Thus, overall the No Project/Status Quo Alternative would cause slightly more significant
12 environmental impacts within the unincorporated portions of Riverside County. It would
13 also result in several new significant impacts where the proposed Project's would be less
14 than significant (e.g., cumulative impacts due to GHG emissions and GHG reduction plan
15 inconsistencies, in particular).

16 Taken together, the significant new greenhouse gas impacts and slightly higher significant
17 impacts across many areas of environmental concern mean this alternative is not the
18 environmentally superior alternative. Further, this alternative meets only one of five of
19 the objectives of the Project, as described above. This means that this alternative is not
20 an acceptable means for achieving the stated Project objectives. For these reasons, the
21 No Project/Status Quo Alternative is deemed not the preferred alternative.

22 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has, pursuant to State CEQA
23 Guidelines section 15093, balanced the benefits of the General Plan Update Project Certifying Program
24 EIR No. 521 against the significant and unavoidable adverse environmental effects described herein, and
25 has determined that each and every one of the following benefits individually outweigh and render
26 acceptable each and every one of those significant environmental effects. The Board of Supervisors
27 hereby declares that the EIR has identified and discussed significant effects that may occur as a result of
28 the Project. With the implementation of the mitigation measures discussed in the EIR, these impacts

1 can be mitigated to a level of less than significant except for the unavoidable and significant impacts
2 discussed in the findings herein. The Board of Supervisors further finds that except for the Project, all
3 other alternatives set forth in the EIR are infeasible because they would prohibit the realization of the
4 Project objectives and/or specific economic, social or other benefits that the Board finds outweigh any
5 environmental benefits of the alternatives.

6 The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that, having reduced the adverse significant
7 environmental effects of the Project, to the extent feasible by adopting the proposed mitigation
8 measures and general plan policies, having considered the entire administrative record on the Project
9 and having weighed the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable significant impacts after
10 mitigation, the Board has determined that the social, economic and environmental benefits of the
11 Project outweigh the potential unavoidable significant impacts and render those potential significant
12 impacts acceptable based upon the following considerations.

13 The Riverside County General Plan is intended to be a blueprint for Riverside County's future. It
14 describes the future growth and development within Riverside County over the long-term. GPA No. 960
15 was designed to provide an update to the existing General Plan's policies, maps and implementing
16 directions. Pursuant to the "Certainty System" established in the Administration Element of the General
17 Plan, the following objectives are to be achieved by this periodic review and update. The General Plan
18 was reviewed and the proposed changes in GPA No. 960 are designed to:

- 19 • Assess General Plan progress and issues related to its implementation.
- 20 • Perform necessary changes amongst Foundation Components within the General Plan.
- 21 • Develop policy, entitlement and technical amendments, as warranted.
- 22 • Extend planning projections another five to ten years into the future and adjust the
23 General Plan to accommodate previously unanticipated needs.
- 24 • Enable the County of Riverside to reassess the Vision and Planning Principles of the
25 General Plan and recommit to them.

26 Accordingly, GPA No. 960 also involved cataloging the amendments that have occurred since
27 2003 and examining the planned intensities and policies of the General Plan to determine if any
28 revisions are needed. Figure 3.2 (Key Regions of Interest for GPA No. 960 (Western County)) and Figure

3.3 (Key Regions of Interest for GPA No. 960 (Eastern County)) in Section 3.0, “*Project Description*” of EIR No. 521 show the general locations of land use-related proposals with spatial components under consideration as part of this Project.

To achieve the update objectives established in the General Plan Administration Element, the General Plan was evaluated and proposals were developed by staff so that:

- The General Plan provides a clear and consistent set of directions for implementing the Riverside County Vision throughout the county over the next five to ten years and into the future (2035 and beyond). Where clarification or additional direction is needed, policies were added or modified. Where no longer relevant or appropriate, policies were deleted or revised.
- The General Plan’s Elements, Area Plans and policies continue to provide clear, consistent direction for implementing Riverside County’s Vision. A thorough evaluation was conducted to determine that the land use direction and planned intensities in these areas remain appropriate for their given locations. Mapping items found to be inconsistent or inappropriate were corrected.
- Policy Areas, Study Areas and Overlays throughout Riverside County continue to ensure coordinated development occurs at appropriate intensities in the manner envisioned in the General Plan. All such policy areas throughout Riverside County were evaluated towards this end to ensure their continued utility.
- Resource maps and other data-based information in the General Plan accurately reflect current data. Towards this end, these maps and other data-based information in the General Plan were examined and updated, as needed. Similarly, the General Plan policies and directives related to these resource maps were also revised where warranted by the updates.
- The references and discussions in the General Plan reflect and address the current statutes, regulations and policies of the County of Riverside and applicable outside agencies. Updates were made as needed to ensure this.

1 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the State CEQA Guidelines section
2 15126 (g) require an EIR to discuss how a proposed project could directly or indirectly lead to economic,
3 population, or housing growth. A project may be growth-inducing if it removes obstacles to growth,
4 taxes community service facilities or encourages other activities which cause significant environmental
5 effects. The discussion is provided in Section 5.4 of EIR No. 521, on pages 5-29 through 5-42, and is
6 summarized as follows:

7 Many of the proposed changes associated with GPA No. 960 would either limit or impede growth
8 (for example, by placing further restrictions on floodplains or wildfire hazard areas) or would induce
9 insignificant amounts of growth (less than 0.1% of the overall growth by Area Plan). The provision of
10 small, scattered incidental rural-commercial retail uses in under-served regions that is expected to result
11 from the proposed incidental rural-commercial policy proposal is an example of this kind of limited,
12 insignificant growth. Only several key specific types of future development actions or projects resulting
13 from GPA No. 960 would, in fact, have the potential to induce significant growth within Riverside
14 County.

15 The proposals that would foster economic, population and housing growth within a portion of
16 Riverside County include the proposed Meadowbrook and Good Hope Rural Village Land Use Overlays
17 (refer to page 5-35 in Section 5.4 of EIR No. 521), and the proposed Northeast Business Park Overlay
18 (refer to page 5-36 in Section 5.4 of EIR No. 521). Changes to sites in the Criteria 2 LUD category would
19 also result in significant growth-inducing effects due to their encroachment into remote or isolated
20 areas. In addition, the proposed changes to the countywide circulation network also have the potential
21 to induce significant growth because of the essential nature of roads in providing access to remote or
22 isolated regions, and in removing impediments to growth by establishing an essential public facility. And,
23 lastly, the proposed circulation level of service (LOS) changes would be directly and indirectly
24 significantly growth-inducing due to the removal of barriers to growth resulting from decreased the time
25 and expense of transportation-related improvements associated with implementing a proposed project.

26 This finding of significant growth-inducing effects associated with GPA No. 960 is not unexpected,
27 however, given the programmatic nature of the Project, its countywide scope and the nearly 50-year
28 buildout period involved. The nature and purpose of a General Plan is inherently growth-inducing, in

1 that it represents a plan for ensuring the orderly growth and development of land within unincorporated
2 Riverside County over time. As such, the myriad policies, plans, procedures and standards outlined
3 throughout the Riverside County General Plan, as updated pursuant to GPA No. 960, as well as EIR No.
4 521 and the existing EIR No. 441, certified for the 2003 RCIP General Plan, collectively serve to mitigate
5 and reduce, where possible, the severity of the environmental effects associated with growth and
6 buildout of Riverside County. With continued diligence in implementing the General Plan, long-term
7 growth within the County of Riverside can continue while environmental effects are kept to the
8 minimum feasible and the unique biological and other important natural resources of Riverside County
9 are protected for the health and enjoyment of both existing residents and future generations to come.

10 Therefore, the Board of Supervisors has, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093,
11 balanced the benefits of the County of Riverside General Plan Update against the significant and
12 unavoidable impacts of the County of Riverside General Plan Update and finds that such impacts are
13 outweighed by the benefits of the County of Riverside General Plan Update that may result from this
14 growth inducement that are specified in the immediately prior section of this resolution. The Board
15 acknowledges this growth as a necessary byproduct and desired result of the Project, which has been
16 developed to stimulate the orderly, balanced development of the Project area.

17 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Final EIR also discusses, pursuant
18 to State CEQA Guidelines section 15126(c) and 15126.2(c), significant irreversible environmental
19 changes and provided in Section 5.2 of EIR No. 521, on pages 5-19 through 5-26. Page 5-22 states the
20 following: "GPA No. 960 does not propose or include any actual development as part of the Project. It
21 does, however, propose changes at the General Plan level that could result in future development of
22 lands, as well as infrastructure, particularly roads and trails. This is most evident in the project
23 components related to land use. In many cases, the Project merely proposes to change the land use
24 potential of a site (i.e., through land use designation change) or area (due to a new or revised policy
25 area, overlay or other policy) in a manner that may increase or lessen future development potential on a
26 site either already developed or already proposed for development under the existing General Plan. In
27 these instances, the proposed changes would not cause new impacts due to the commitment of future
28 generations to similar uses. Likewise, the various informational item changes proposed in the Safety

1 Element and Multipurpose Open Space Element also would not affect future commitments. Because
2 they disturb such small areas and are typically easily reversible, the new trail alignments proposed in
3 GPA No. 960 also would not be considered a source of significant irreversible change.”

4 Additionally, with regard to non-renewable resources (resources that comes from the earth and
5 cannot be readily replenished within the human timescale, including but not limited to, mineral
6 resources, particularly aggregate and metal ores, and fossil energy resources, such as oil, coal and
7 natural gas), pages 5-20 and 5-21 state that the Project would “potentially enable future development in
8 a variety of areas – increasing development potential in some areas, decreasing the potential in others.
9 Among the project items with a land use component, no refineries, large-scale manufactories or large-
10 scale infrastructure development (i.e., hydroelectric dams, nuclear reactors, wastewater treatment
11 facilities, canals, interstate freeways, etc.) or other massive structures (skyscrapers, penitentiaries, etc.)
12 are proposed or planned which would necessitate the commitment of large amounts of aggregates,
13 including rock, sand, gravel, cement and other minerals to accommodate the project. Road-building,
14 which utilizes large amounts of aggregates, will occur throughout Riverside County as per the
15 countywide circulation network proposed for the updated General Plan. These roads, however, would
16 be constructed incrementally in segments over the next 50 years. Accordingly, demands for aggregate
17 resources would remain relatively consistent over this period, with demand increasing roughly according
18 to county growth rates. As such, demand for aggregate materials would be relatively constant,
19 fluctuating mainly with growth rates and well within the forecast horizons of supply availability for the
20 Riverside County’s Production-Consumption Regions (refer to Section 4.14, “*Mineral Resources*” in EIR
21 No. 521 for more details on mineral resources). Similarly, in relation to ores and metals, no foreseeable
22 mining uses, large-scale manufactories, foundries, smelters, high-tech device plants or energy-
23 generation uses, which include wind farms, non-photovoltaic solar farms and other energy plant
24 facilities that would require large amounts of various metals, particularly copper, for use in the motors
25 that ultimately generate the electricity, are proposed or planned which would necessitate the
26 commitment of large amounts of ore or metals in their construction or operation. In total, none of the
27 items proposed as part of GPA No. 960 would necessitate a large commitment of nonrenewable
28

resources in a manner that makes their later removal or non-use unlikely. The Project would not result in a significant irreversible change in the environment due to the use of non-renewable resources.”

In conclusion, page 5-26 states that, “The future development potentially accommodated in some locations as a result of the LUD changes proposed under GPA No. 960 would, however, lead to irreversible changes in the middle of vacant, undeveloped land with intact native vegetation and other natural resources, due to development and possibly the need to provide access, water, sewer collection and other infrastructure. In other areas, it would result in the extension of an existing development pattern (most typically rural or agricultural) into open lands lying on the border between developing areas and native open space. Because of the difficulty in restoring previously untouched areas to fully functional natural resource values, including biological, hydrological, geological, in addition to edge effects, the future development of these areas would represent significant irreversible changes in the environment and likely commit future generations to perpetuating the resultant developed uses. Introduction of roads into previously inaccessible areas would have a similar effect. Although roads in and of themselves can have relatively small impact footprints, in some cases the growth-inducing effects that accompany such roads (due to opening access to new areas) create a whole suite of attendant effects that can collectively result in significant irreversible impacts to previously untouched, vacant open space lands. The individual environmental effects of future development in specific locations are addressed and, in many cases mitigated to less than significant levels, in the respective parts of Section 4.0 of EIR No. 521. However, notwithstanding these mitigation measures, the irreversible nature of the effects to natural open space areas would remain significant due to their essentially irreversible nature. This effect is a cumulative outcome would result from the buildout of the General Plan, both the existing General Plan and for the updated General Plan, as proposed pursuant to GPA No. 960. As such, the policies and programs outlined in the General Plan itself, as well as the proposed Climate Action Plan, EIR No. 521 and existing EIR No. 441, which was certified for the 2003 adoption of the RCIP General Plan, provide a suite of measures that mitigate the effects of continued county growth. However, no other specific mitigation measures are feasible with regard to this effect. As such, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.”

1 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and considered EIR
2 No. 521 in evaluating the County of Riverside General Plan Update that EIR No. 521 is an accurate and
3 objective statement that complies with CEQA and reflects the County's independent judgment, and that
4 EIR No. 521 is incorporated herein by this reference.

5 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it ADOPTS the statement of
6 overriding considerations, CERTIFIES EIR No. 521, and ADOPTS the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting
7 Plan (MMRP) attached as Attachment A hereto. To the extent that there are inconsistencies between
8 the mitigation measures set forth in EIR No. 521 and those set forth in the Mitigation and Monitoring
9 Plan, the Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall control.

10 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it ADOPTS the Climate Action Plan, as
11 proposed, in compliance with AB 32 in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.

12 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the custodians of the documents and
13 other materials that constitute the record of proceeding upon which this decision is based are the Clerk
14 of the Board of Supervisors and the County Planning Department and that such documents are located
15 at 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, California.

ATTACHMENT C

**Resolution No. 2015-260 Amending the Riverside County General Plan (Third Cycle
General Plan Amendments for 2015) and adopting GPA No. 960**

**RESOLUTION NO. 2015-260
AMENDING THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY
GENERAL PLAN
(Third Cycle General Plan Amendments for 2015)**

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65350 et seq., notice was given and public hearings were held before the Riverside County Board of Supervisors and before the Riverside County Planning Commission in Riverside, California to consider proposed amendments to the Riverside County General Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Administration Element of the Riverside County General Plan provides that a General Plan Review Cycle shall begin in 2008 and occur periodically every eight years thereafter; and,

WHEREAS, the General Plan Review Cycle is intended to assess the General Plan progress and issues related to its implementation and may include policy, entitlement, technical and Foundation Component amendments; and,

WHEREAS, all provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and Riverside County CEQA implementing procedures have been satisfied; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed general plan amendment was discussed fully with testimony and documentation presented by the public and affected government agencies; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside in regular session assembled on December 8, 2015 that:

1. General Plan Amendment No. 960 (GPA No. 960) represents the first comprehensive General Plan update since the adoption of the 2003 Riverside County General Plan and was initiated by the Board of Supervisors on October 21, 2008.

2. In accordance with the General Plan's Administration Element, GPA No. 960 is a comprehensive review of the County's General Plan and incorporates changes to the Vision Statement, modifications to seven of the nine General Plan Elements and all 19 Area Plans, numerous mapping and statistical updates, land use changes on more than 21,000 acres, modifications to seven appendices, and the addition of five new appendices. Additionally, GPA No. 960 does the following:

- a. Updates existing General Plan policies, maps and implementing directions.

- b. Ensures that the General Plan's Elements, Area Plans and policies continue to provide clear, consistent direction for implementing Riverside County's Vision.
- c. Updates Policy Areas, Study Areas and Overlays throughout Riverside County to ensure their continued utility and that coordinated development occurs at appropriate intensities in the manner envisioned in the General Plan.
- d. Updates resource maps and other data-based information in the General Plan as well as the related General Plan policies and directives.
- e. Updates references and language in the General Plan to reflect current statutes, regulations and policies of the County of Riverside and applicable outside agencies.
- f. Corrects mapping items found to be inconsistent or inappropriate.

3. The updates to Overlays referenced above revise policy language and figures in the County's General Plan. These revisions do not change a specific property's land use designation. In order to develop consistent with the policies set forth in an Overlay, property owners need to submit and process a separate application for the appropriate General Plan amendment.

4. All updates and revisions made to the County's General Plan by GPA No. 960 and by privately initiated General Plan amendments that were adopted by the Board of Supervisors from January 1, 2010 through September 22, 2015 shall be read together so as to give effect to each and not render any one of them meaningless. GPA No. 960 does not nullify the privately initiated General Plan amendments adopted by the Board of Supervisors from January 1, 2010 through September 22, 2015.

5. GPA No. 960 also incorporates the Riverside County Climate Action Plan (CAP) pursuant to state law.

6. The Planning Commission considered GPA No. 960, the accompanying CAP and EIR No. 521 at public hearings held on August 19, 2015, August 26, 2015 and September 16, 2015. The Planning Commission recommended approval of GPA No. 960 with modifications.

7. The Board of Supervisors considered GPA No. 960 with the Planning Commission's modifications and the associated CAP and EIR No. 521 at a public hearing held on November 10, 2015.

1 8. After considering all the interests presented during the public hearings and the written
2 testimony, the Board of Supervisors closed the public hearing, continued the item to December 8, 2015
3 and directed staff to prepare the final necessary documents for approval.

4 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors, based on the evidence presented
5 on this matter, both written and oral, including Program EIR No. 521, that:

6 1. The General Plan Administration Element requires a General Plan Review Cycle every
7 eight years to assess the General Plan progress, the County Vision, policies of the General Plan, Planning
8 Principles and issues related to the General Plan's implementation. One objective of the General Plan's
9 Certainty System is to monitor progress in implementing the General Plan and correct its direction where
10 necessary. GPA No. 960 meets the purpose of the General Plan Certainty System by implementing this
11 eight year periodic review and:

- 12 a. Assesses General Plan progress and issues related to its implementation.
- 13 b. Performs necessary changes amongst Foundation Components within the General Plan.
- 14 c. Develops policy, entitlement and technical amendments, as warranted.
- 15 d. Extends planning projections another five to ten years into the future and adjusts the
16 General Plan to accommodate previously unanticipated needs.
- 17 e. Reassesses the Vision and Planning Principles of the General Plan and recommits to
18 them.

19 2. GPA No. 960 is a comprehensive review of the County's General Plan that updates
20 existing General Plan policies, maps and implementing directions. It makes changes to the Vision
21 Statement, modifications to seven of the nine General Plan Elements and all 19 Area Plans, numerous
22 mapping and statistical updates, land use changes to more than 21,000 acres, modifications to seven
23 appendices and the addition of five new appendices. As such, GPA No. 960 includes Foundation
24 Component Amendments, Entitlement/Policy Amendments and Technical Amendments.

25 3. GPA No. 960 complies with the findings set forth in the General Plan Administration
26 Element and Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of Ordinance No. 348 for Foundation Component Amendments,
27 Entitlement/Policy Amendments and Technical Amendments. Specifically, the modifications made by
28 GPA No. 960 are needed to adjust to new and special conditions existing in Riverside County such as

changing growth patterns, implementation of the Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and the Coachella Valley MSHCP and water management; to comply with new laws including Senate Bill No. 32, Assembly Bill No. 1881 and Assembly Bill No. 1358; to plan and coordinate for more intense development, and to ensure that growth is balanced with appropriate public services, infrastructure and basic necessities for healthy and livable communities.

4. Additionally, GPA No. 960 does not conflict with the Riverside County Vision or any General Planning Principles. GPA No. 960 provides a clear and consistent set of directions for implementing the Vision including but not limited to the following:

- a. Adding policies to the General Plan that further implement the Vision including but not limited to: adding Incidental Rural Commercial Policies, allowing quarterly updates to Spheres of Influence and Flood Hazard information;
- b. Evaluating and changing policies, maps and land use information where found redundant or inconsistent with the Vision such as establishing the Meadowbrook and Good Hope Rural Village Overlays and removal of the El Cariso Village, Anza Valley and Aguanga Rural Village Overlay Study Areas;
- c. Enhancing the Vision Statement by adding a Sustainability and Global Environmental Stewardship component and expands the Vision to include all ethnic communities;
- d. Enhancing policies related to water conservation, management, water quality, ground water recharge, and energy conservation; and
- e. Improving non-motorized transportation components and policies.

5. GPA No. 960 also updates the General Plan to ensure internal consistency among the General Plan elements, removes errors that become known during the comprehensive review of the General Plan and clarifies language to more accurately express the General Plan's meaning or eliminate a source of confusion.

6. GPA No. 960 improves consistency with the adopted Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

1 7. The Airport Land Use Commission found GPA No. 960 consistent with all the applicable
2 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans.

3 8. GPA No. 960 is consistent with the Administration Element of the Riverside County
4 General Plan and serves as a guide for orderly growth and development, preservation and conservation of
5 open-space land and natural resources within Riverside County.

6 9. GPA No. 960 will not preclude reserve design for either the Western Riverside County
7 MSHCP or the Coachella Valley MSHCP or any other habitat conservation plan within Riverside County.

8 10. For the reasons set forth above and in the staff reports presented to the Planning
9 Commission and the Board of Supervisors, incorporated herein by reference, GPA No. 960 is consistent
10 with the Administration Element of the General Plan and Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of Ordinance No. 348.

11 11. GPA No. 960 will not be detrimental to public health, safety and general welfare.

12 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **CERTIFIES** the
13 Environmental Impact Report No. 521 ("EIR") and finds that the EIR has been completed in compliance
14 with CEQA and that the EIR was presented to, reviewed and considered by the Board of Supervisors prior
15 to rendering its decision and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board of
16 Supervisors.

17 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **ADOPTS** the findings
18 required by Public Resources Code Section 21081 with respect to each of the significant environmental
19 impacts of the project identified in the EIR, including the Statement of Overriding Considerations which
20 are set forth in Resolution No. 2015-259 and incorporated herein by reference.

21 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors, based on the evidence presented
22 on this matter, including EIR No. 521, that it **ADOPTS** General Plan Amendment No. 960 as described
23 herein, in the EIR Errata dated December 8, 2015 and in the GPA No. 960 text dated February 2015.

24 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the custodians of the
25 documents upon which this decision is based are the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and the County
26 Planning Department, and that such documents are located at 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, California.

ATTACHMENT D

**Notice of Determination (NOD) to be filed with the County Clerk and the State Office of
Planning and Research in accordance with CEQA**

Notice of Determination**Appendix D****To:**☒ Office of Planning and Research

U.S. Mail:

P.O. Box 3044

Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Street Address:

1400 Tenth St., Rm 113

Sacramento, CA 95814

☒ County Clerk

County of: Riverside

Address: 2724 Gateway Drive
Riverside, CA 92507**From:**Public Agency: County of Riverside Planning Dept.
Address: 4080 Lemon St. 12th Floor
Riverside, CA 92501

Contact: Kristi Lovelady, Principal Planner

Phone: (951)955-6892

Lead Agency (if different from above):

Address:

Contact:

Phone:

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to State Clearinghouse):

Project Title: Riverside County General Plan Update GPA No. 960, Climate Action Plan and EIR No. 521

Project Applicant: County of Riverside

Project Location (include county): Riverside County

Project Description:

This is to advise that the _____
☒ Lead Agency or ☐ Responsible Agency) has approved the above
described project on _____ and has made the following determinations regarding the above
(date) described project.

1. The project ☒ will ☐ will not] have a significant effect on the environment.
2. ☒ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
☐ A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures ☒ were ☐ were not] made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan ☒ was ☐ was not] adopted for this project.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations ☒ was ☐ was not] adopted for this project.
6. Findings ☒ were ☐ were not] made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the final EIR with comments and responses and record of project approval, or the
negative Declaration, is available to the General Public at:

Riverside County Planning Department Office (Riverside) and online at www.planning.rctlma.org

Signature (Public Agency): Steve Klein Title: Riverside County Planning Director

Date: 11/25/15

Date Received for filing at OPR: _____

Authority cited: Sections 21083, Public Resources Code.
Reference Section 21000-21174, Public Resources Code.

Revised 2011