



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



930

FROM: Parks Department

SUBMITTAL DATE:
2/23/10

SUBJECT: Adoption of Addendum No. 1 to Environmental Assessment No. 38521 for the Upgrade and Expansion of Mayflower Park

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board:

1. Consider Addendum No. 1 in conjunction with the original Mitigated Negative Declaration for Environmental Assessment No. 38521 (EA 38521);
2. Adopt Addendum No. 1 to Environmental Assessment No. 38521;
3. Approve the project described in EA 38521 and as modified by Addendum No. 1.

BACKGROUND: On October 28, 2003, the Board adopted a mitigated negative declaration for Environmental Assessment No. 38521, based on the findings and conclusions that the proposed upgrade and expansion of Mayflower Park would not have a significant effect on the environment. Now, the Department wishes to further refine the scope of work in Addendum No. 1 to add replacement of the existing entry kiosk, construction of a new maintenance building in a previously-disturbed area, and expansion of the dry storage area. Addendum No. 1 concludes that the proposed changes in the scope of work will not call for preparation of a subsequent negative declaration and will not require any additional mitigation.

759
SL/mg

[Signature]
Scot Bangle, General Manager

FINANCIAL DATA

Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$ -0-	In Current Year Budget:	N/A
Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$ -0-	Budget Adjustment:	N/A
Annual Net County Cost:	\$ -0-	For Fiscal Year:	09-10

SOURCE OF FUNDS:

Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requires 4/5 Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

BY *[Signature]*
Michael R. Shetler

County Executive Office Signature

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Stone, seconded by Supervisor Benoit and duly carried, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as recommended.

Ayes: Buster, Stone, Benoit and Ashley
Nays: None
Absent: Tavaglione
Date: February 23, 2010
xc: Parks

Kecia Harper-Ihem
Clerk of the Board
By *[Signature]*
Deputy

District 4

ATTACHMENTS FILED
WITH THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

13.1

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: *[Signature]* DATE: *[Signature]*
ARISA R-MCKENNA Departmental Concurrence

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

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY
PARKS DEPARTMENT**

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

Original Negative Declaration/Notice of Determination was ~~routed~~ to County Clerks for posting on. *H/C*

TO:
 Office of Planning and Research (OPR)
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814
 County Clerk
County of Riverside

FROM:
Riverside County Parks Department
4600 Crestmore Road
Riverside CA 92509

2-24-10 SM
Date Initial
** H/C by Parks Dept*

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

Mayflower Park Expansion Addendum No. 1 to EA # 38521
Project Title: Case Numbers

State Clearinghouse Number Steve Lech (951) 955-4318
Contact Person Area Code/No./Ext.

Riverside County Parks Department, 4600 Crestmore Road, Riverside CA 92509
Project Applicant/Property Owner and Address

Six miles northeast of Blythe, off of 6th Ave. at the end of Colorado River Road in Section 12, T6S, R23E
Project Location

Add to the existing EA and NOD the replacement of the existing entry kiosk, construction of a new maintenance building in a previously-disturbed area, and expansion of the dry storage area
Project Description

This is to advise that the Riverside County Board of Supervisors has approved the above-referenced project on February 23, 2010, and has made the following determinations regarding that project:

1. The project will, will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the project and certified pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.
 A Negative Declaration was prepared for the project pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.
3. Mitigation Measures were, were not made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. Findings were made in accordance with Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations , was, was not adopted for the project.

This is to certify that the Addendum No. 1 to EA No. 38521 is available to the general public at the Riverside County Parks Department Headquarters, 4600 Crestmore Road, Riverside CA 92509


Signature
FSUSERS\SL\JOHNSONOD.wpd

Parks Director
Title

February 4, 2010
Date

Verified by: Sandi Schlemmer Deputy Clerk of the Board February 23, 2010
Sandi Schlemmer, Deputy Clerk for Kecia Harper-Ihem, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

02.23.10 13.1

TO BE COMPLETED BY OPR Date Received for Filing and Posting at OPR:	FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY <i>Please charge deposit fee case #:</i>
---	--

ADDENDUM No. 1 to the
CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration

Mayflower Park Upgrade & Expansion
EA #38521
SCH# 2005081124

Prepared by:

Riverside County
Regional Park & Open-Space District
4600 Crestmore Road
Riverside, CA 92509
(951) 955-4310

January 2010

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: Larisa R-McKenna 2/8/10
LARISA R-MCKENNA DATE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the Addendum

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was written in 1981 that included Mayflower Park, and two Mitigated Negative Declarations (MND) were prepared including one in 2003 for park expansion and use of septic tanks for wastewater and one in 2006 based on upgrading septic systems to City of Blythe sewage treatment. The MND for the Mayflower Park Upgrade and Expansion project was adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors on October 28, 2003. A Notice of Determination was filed with the Riverside County Clerk's Office on November 6, 2003. The MND addressed the expansion and upgrade of an existing 24 acre park to provide an additional 62 acres and to upgrade the park from a septic system to a sanitary sewer system. The sewer system was to connect with City of Blythe facilities and sized to serve only the park and adjacent homes. Park expansion included an additional 131 camping spaces, 14 cabins and additional recreational amenities.

Since the latest approval of the project, slight modifications have been made to the proposed onsite facilities. Specifically, the following changes to the previously approved project need to be addressed at this time. The documents do not address the installation of a new water well, replacement of the existing entry kiosk in the same location (although it does call for the entry station's upgrade), construction of a new maintenance building, expansion of the existing dry storage yard, construction of a new playground and water play feature, construction of walking trails with exercise stations, and placement of several small recreational amenities (such as horseshoe pits, lawn bowling area, etc).

This Addendum complies with the provisions of the California Quality Act (CEQA) and Sections 15162 and 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, which governs the preparation of an Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15164 says that an addendum to a Negative Declaration may be prepared where minor changes or additions are necessary and none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or Negative Declaration exist.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, a subsequent EIR or Negative Declaration must be prepared when: (1) substantial changes are proposed in the project, or occur with respect to the project circumstances, which will require major revisions to the previous EIR or Negative Declaration; (2) important new information indicates one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration; or (3) important new information indicates that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration.

This Addendum clarifies that changes to the approved Mayflower Park Upgrade and Expansion project do not meet the criteria outlined above calling for preparation of a subsequent Negative Declaration. Therefore, this project-level analysis of the aforementioned improvements to the project is appropriately addressed in an addendum to the MND.

1.2 Contents and Format of the Addendum

This Addendum includes the following:

Section 1.0 Introduction: This section describes the content of the Addendum.

Section 2.0 Project Description: This section describes the project addressed in this Addendum, and also includes a description of measures incorporated to minimize the project's environmental impacts.

Section 3.0 Determination: This section addresses the criteria provided in the CEQA Guidelines regarding the environmental documentation from the project, and explains why the project-level analysis of the changes is appropriately addressed in this Addendum to the MND.

Section 4.0 Rationale: This section addresses the environmental resource issues relevant to the changes in the proposed project and explains why the proposed project would not create new significant effects or increase the severity of impacts discussed in the MND. Each of the resource areas addressed in the approved MND is analyzed in this section.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section of the Addendum describes the project and includes a description of measures incorporated to minimize the project's environmental impacts.

2.1 Location and Setting

Mayflower Park is located approximately ½ mile north of the City limits of Blythe in unincorporated Riverside County adjacent to the Colorado River (Figure I, Regional Map). Regional access is provided by Interstate 10 and Colorado River Road provides local access to Mayflower Park via 6th Avenue. The proposed improvements will be limited to previously-disturbed areas of Mayflower Park.

2.2 Project Characteristics

As discussed above, the original MND for the Mayflower Park Upgrade and Expansion project was adopted in 2003. Addendum No. 1 will address minor revisions to the scope of work. These revisions include the installation of a new water well, replacement of the existing entry kiosk in the same location, construction of a new maintenance building, expansion of the existing dry storage yard, construction of a new playground and water play feature, construction of walking trails with exercise stations, and placement of several small recreational amenities (such as horseshoe pits, lawn bowling area, etc.), all of which will occur in previously disturbed areas. The proposed changes do not meet the criteria for a Subsequent Negative Declaration per CEQA Guidelines Section 15162.

2.3 Measures to Minimize Impacts

Mitigation measures have been incorporated as elements of the previously approved MND. Some of these measures would only apply to the park expansion which has already been implemented. Those measures that may apply to either the previous park expansion or the proposed sewer/water line extensions are listed below.

Cultural Resources

Mitigation Measure I: All grading shall be monitored for archaeological resources.

Mitigation Measure 2: All grading shall be monitored for paleontological resources.

Geology and Soils

Mitigation Measure J: Require contractor to implement standard construction procedures to prevent erosion.

3.0 DETERMINATION

CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 through 15164 set forth the criteria for determining the appropriate environmental documentation, if any, to be completed when there is a pre-existing certified Negative Declaration covering the project. The Riverside County Parks Department hereby makes the following findings, and the Rationale of Findings is presented in Section 4.0 of this document.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162(a) states that when an EIR has been certified or Negative Declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the

lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Discussion: As discussed in Section 4.0 of this Addendum, no substantial changes are proposed in the project which would result in new significant effects or an increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. As such, major revisions to the previous MND are not required to reflect the proposed project change.

2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Discussion: No change has been identified in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken.

3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified or the Negative Declaration adopted, shows any of the following:

- A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;

Discussion: As discussed in Section 4.0 of this document, no new significant effects would be associated with the proposed project changes.

- B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration;

Discussion: As discussed in Section 4.0 of this document, no significant impacts would be substantially more severe than previously analyzed and disclosed.

- C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative;

Discussion: As discussed in Section 4.0 of this document, no previously identified mitigation measures or alternatives have been determined to be infeasible. No alternatives were analyzed in the original adopted MND per CEQA requirements.

- D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considered different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Discussion: No new mitigation measures or alternatives have been identified.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(a) states that "The lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR or adopted Negative Declaration if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or Negative Declaration have occurred."

Discussion: None of the conditions requiring the preparation of a subsequent EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 have occurred. Therefore, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, and based on the rationale presented in Section 4.0 of this document, the environmental analysis for the project changes is appropriately addressed as an Addendum to the MND.

4.0 RATIONALE

The proposed project changes would not create new significant environmental impacts or increase the severity of impacts identified in the previously adopted MND. The following rationale has been provided as documentary support of these conclusions. The environmental impacts and mitigation measures outlined in the adopted MND are applicable to the proposed amendment to the project. In accordance with CEQA Section 15150 which allows incorporation by reference of all or portions of another document which is a matter of public record, those impacts and mitigation measures are incorporated in this Addendum by reference. The approved MND found only two areas where potential impacts may occur which require mitigation, as discussed below. No additional significant impacts related to project changes are anticipated to occur and no mitigation measures beyond those contained in the approved MND are required.

4.1 Aesthetics

The adopted MND found that no significant impacts to aesthetics or scenic resources would occur as a result of project implementation. Proposed changes to the project including addition of a maintenance building, expansion of the existing dry storage area, and addition of a new potable water well would not result in new visual quality impacts as they are proposed for areas that are currently being used in the same capacity. Although project changes do involve above-ground structures, existing views in the area will not be substantially impacted because the proposed improvements will be in areas that are currently in much the same land use as those proposed.

4.2 Agriculture Resources

Although the park expansion area was previously in agricultural production, the MND found the project would have no effect on existing agricultural uses. Proposed changes to the project would have no affect on any agriculture resources as the expansion area is currently not in agricultural use, nor will it be since it is now a part of Mayflower Park.

4.3 Air Quality

The MND found that the project would have no significant air quality impacts by either being exposed to substantial pollution sources or as a source of pollution. Standard Riverside County, City of Blythe and South Coast Air Quality Management District construction guidelines for pollution and dust control will be implemented as applicable. Changes to the project will not result any significant new air quality impacts.

4.4 Biological Resources

The MND found that the project would have no significant impacts on biological resources. Proposed changes to the project would not result in any additional impacts to biological resources as they will occur within areas previously disturbed by agricultural activities and have been continuously disked for weed control.

4.5 Cultural Resources

Section V.8 of the adopted MND indicates a cultural resource report was completed for the expansion area in 1981 but found no cultural or historical resources. Additionally, Section V.9 indicates the site is not located in an area known for paleontological sensitivity. However, measures from the MND, as outlined in Section 2.3 of this Addendum shall be incorporated into the proposed project extension which requires monitoring during grading activities. Incorporation of these measures would reduce potential cultural resources impacts due to project construction to less than significant levels.

4.6 Geology and Soils

Section V. 17 of the adopted MND states the geotechnical report dated July 11, 2003 found there are potentially expansive soils in the project area which should be removed from building pad areas. Changes to the project from the adopted MND will involve 1 building pad. Adherence to measures outlined in the geotechnical report would normally be a precursor to construction of any building. Since that would occur anyway, no additional mitigation measures will be incorporated as part of this MND Addendum. Furthermore, Section V.18 of the adopted MND indicates that soil erosion control measures should be implemented. Therefore, the mitigation outlined in Section 2.3 of this Addendum shall be incorporated into the proposed project revisions. Incorporation of this measure would reduce potential erosion impacts due to project construction to less than significant levels.

4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The MND concludes that no significant impacts related to exposure of the public to hazards or hazardous materials will occur. Changes in the proposed project would not involve any additional concerns related to hazards and hazardous materials. Although part of the proposed project is the construction of a maintenance facility, it will replace the existing, outdated facility. No additional impacts to the area will occur.

4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

As noted in the approved MND, the project will maintain existing drainage patterns on the site and will not alter the course of any streams or rivers. Changes in the proposed project will not cause any additional concerns related to drainage. As noted above (item 4.6) standard erosion control measures will be implemented during project construction. The MND indicates that currently the existing park uses well water for non-potable purposes. A new well is part of the proposed additions, and will be engineered for potable service. All surface runoff water will be captured and retained on-site per the Water Quality Control Plan.

4.9 Land Use and Planning

No Significant impacts related to land use and planning were identified in the approved MND. The uses planned for the park will remain the same as they are, only at an expanded level. These uses

will not create a substantial alteration of the existing or proposed land use. No conflicts with any other land use policies or programs will occur.

4.10 Mineral Resources

The project area has not been identified as containing any known mineral resources and changes to the project would not affect such resources.

4.11 Noise

No significant noise impacts were identified by the approved MND and changes to the project are not expected to result in any additional noise impacts. Construction noise will be temporary and restricted to the hours specified by the City and/or Riverside County as applicable.

4.12 Population and Housing

No Significant impacts related to population and housing were identified in the approved MND. Changes in the project do not involve any residential uses which would result in direct population growth nor would any housing be displaced.

4.13 Public Services

The approved MND did not identify any significant impacts related to public services including fire, police, schools, libraries, or health services. Implementation of the proposed changes will not result in any additional need for such services; therefore no impact would occur.

4.14 Recreation

The project is designed to improve existing recreational facilities and would therefore not impact other recreational facilities. Changes in the project will result in further improvements and no impacts would occur.

4.15 Transportation and Traffic

No significant transportation and circulation impacts were identified in the approved MND. Project modifications will not result in any additional traffic concerns. Per standard County construction practices, the contractor for the proposed changes will be required to ensure adequate vehicular access for affected roadways during construction.

4.16 Utilities and Service Systems

The approved MND did not identify any significant impacts related to utilities including water, sewer, and solid waste.

Conclusion

Based on the preceding analysis and as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 through 15164, no substantial changes are proposed in the project which would result in new significant effects or an increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. As such, this addendum to the previously approved MND is the appropriate environmental documentation as discussed herein and no further analysis is necessary.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 38521

Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department

Address: 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor

Contact Person: Kim Jarrell Johnson, Assistant Park Planner

Telephone Number: (909) 955-6515

Applicant's Name: Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District

Applicant's Address: 4600 Crestmore Road, Riverside CA 92509

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. **Project Description:** Mayflower Park is an existing 24 acre County Regional Park built after the land for the park was purchased in 1967. It was designed to provide the residents of Riverside County recreational opportunities adjacent to the Colorado River, the County's eastern border. Mayflower Park currently has 88 camping spaces, boat launching facilities for the river, and a swim lagoon. An additional 62 acres located on the north and west side of the park have been purchased to expand the park. In the expansion area the District plans to add 72 additional camping spaces. Additional improvements anticipated include new laundry facilities, irrigation system improvement, electrical system upgrade, well upgrade, and a new camp store and recreation room.

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

C. Total Project Area:

Residential: Acres n/a ; n/a Lots ; Units ; Projected No. of Residents .
Commercial: Acres n/a ; n/a Lots ; Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area ; Est. No. of Employees
Industrial: Acres n/a ; n/a Lots ; Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area ; Est. No. of Employees
Other: Recreational Facility 86 acres

D. Assessor's Parcel No(s):

Existing park: 833-070-003, 004, 006, 008

Expansion area: 833-070-009, 010

E. **Street References:** Six miles northeast of Blythe off of 6th Avenue at the end of Colorado River Road.

F. **Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:** T6S, R23E Section 12

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings:

Mayflower Park is an existing 24 acre campground located on the Colorado River. It has 88 campsites. Boats can be launched from a boat ramp on the Colorado River. To the west and north of the park is farmland where winter wheat was the most recent crop. To the east is the Colorado River. To the south is vacant land and an existing residential area consisting of single family mobile homes.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE POLICIES AND ZONING

A. Open Space and Conservation Map Designation(s): Parks/Forests

B. Land Use Planning Area (L.U.P.A.) Information

- 1. L. U. P. A. Name(s): Chuckwalla
- 2. Subarea, if any: Palo Verde Valley
- 3. Community Policy Area, if any: None

C. Community Plan Land Use Allocation Map Information

- 1. Community Plan, if any: none
- 2. Community Plan Land Use Designation, if any: none

D. Adopted Specific Plan Information

- 1. Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any: None
- 2. Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any: None

E. Existing Zoning: R-R, R-1-1500, R-4-7800, R-4-9200, R-5, C-1/C-P

F. Proposed Zoning, if any: n/a

G. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: R-R

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

IV. DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment **NOTHING FURTHER IS REQUIRED** because all potentially significant effects (a) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.
- I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An **ADDENDUM** to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.
- I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a **SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.
- I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a **SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or,
 - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

Tracie Ruiz-Hollis
Signature

March 25, 2002
Date

Tracie Ruiz-Hollis
Printed Name

For Aleta J. Laurence, A.I.C.P., Planning Director

V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

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

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

AESTHETICS Would the project

1. Scenic Resources

a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?

Source: Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan (CGP) Fig. VI.45

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project is not within a scenic highway corridor.
- b) No specific scenic resources or features are located on site. The proposed project will not significantly change the appearance of the existing campground. The undeveloped portion of the project area is currently used for farming. That area will be developed with a campground. Landscaping will be installed as part of the project. The primary viewing point of the project is from the Colorado River. The view from the river will change from campground and farmland to a larger campground.

Mitigation: A landscaping plan will be developed as part of this project. The landscaping it proposes will enhance the view shed of the area from the Colorado River, and will act to mask and soften the expanded campground.

Monitoring: None required

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory

Interfere with the night time use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?

Source: GIS data base, Ord. No. 655, CGP Fig. II.27, EIR 329

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Ne Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact: The project site is located outside the 45 mile radius defined by Ord. 655 and the 30 mile radius defined by the Comprehensive General Plan as the Mt. Palomar Special Lighting District and is not subject to these special lighting policies.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

3. Other Lighting Issues

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

Source: Preliminary park master plan

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will introduce new sources of night time light to the area. Lighting proposed for the campground expansion area will be solar powered, directed downward, and the minimum needed for safety. Design features will be used to reduce "night glow." The only existing residences are to the west of the existing campground. The expansion area will not be adjacent to these homes and will not increase the amount of light spill onto those homes. That residential area will not be subject to unacceptable light levels.

Mitigation: Light fixtures used shall be designed to reduce "night glow."

Monitoring: None required

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES Would the project

4. Agriculture

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract (Riv. Co. Agricultural Land Conservation Contract Maps)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 Right-to-Farm)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Source: CGP Fig. VI.34-VI.35, Ordinance No. 625, EIR 329

Findings of Fact:

- a) The 64 acres purchased for the park expansion is designated Prime Farmland. This area was in agricultural

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

production, most recently winter wheat, before it was purchased by the District. The property falls under an approved specific plan. Specific plan 175 was approved July 12, 1983 and included residential and commercial zoning.

b) The property purchased for the park expansion is not under an agricultural preserve contract.

c) There is no agriculturally zoned property within 300 feet of this project.

d) The proposed project consists of the upgrading of the existing Mayflower Park and expansion of the park area. Mayflower Park was first developed in the late 1960s. The property purchased for the park expansion is zoned for residential and commercial uses. The park use planned for this land now is less intensive than the zoning on the property would have allowed and will be less likely to cause the conversion of any nearby land currently under agricultural production. Adjacent land is zoned "rural-residential," and is not agriculturally zoned.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

AIR QUALITY Would the project

5. Air Quality Impacts

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Section F, preliminary park master plan

Findings of Fact:

a-f) According to the CGP, parks are sensitive receptors to air pollution and should not be located near sources of heavy pollution such as major roadways. This project is not near any such pollution source. This project will also not be a source of pollution. Mayflower Park currently has two full time and two temporary employees who travel to and from the park every day. The expansion will not cause the need for a dramatic increase in staff. The District anticipates hiring two additional full time and one seasonal staff member when the expansion is complete. Blythe is not in a nonattainment area for air quality according to the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The project will not create objectionable odors.

Mitigation: None required

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

Monitoring: None required

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project

6. Wildlife & Vegetation

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Fig. VI.36-VI.40

Findings of Fact:

- a) This project will not be in conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conversation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, state, or regional conservation plan.
- b) There is a small amount of riparian habitat in the existing park in the area of the swim lagoon that may be inhabited by endangered or threatened riparian and/or marsh species. The proposed project will not impact the riparian area, therefore no mitigation is needed.
- c) See b above.
- d) At this time, it does not appear that the project will interfere with any migratory corridors. However, because the riparian area will not be disturbed, no impact should occur to any potential migratory corridors.
- e) See b above.
- f) The project will not have a substantial adverse impact on any federally protected wetlands.
- g) The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

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

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: As required to implement all necessary mitigation measures.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

7. Historic Resources

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Alter or destroy an historic site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: District files

Findings of Fact:

a&b) The project site does not contain any building over 50 years of age. No impacts to historical resources will occur.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

8. Archaeological Resources

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: CGP Fig. VI.32-VI.33 & VI.46-VI.48, Environmental Impact Evaluation by Christopher Drover, March 1981

Findings of Fact: Mayflower Park was first built in the late 1960s and has been in continuous use since then. An archeological survey was done on the expansion area in 1981. That report found no cultural or historical sites or artifacts. However, the District will have all grading on site monitored so if subsurface artifacts are found they can be properly recovered.

Mitigation: Monitor all grading.

Monitoring: Monitor all grading.

9. Paleontological Resources

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Source: CGP Paleontological Sensitivity Resources Map

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

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located in an area know for paleontological resources. However, all grading, particularly the excavation of the lagoon, will be monitored for paleontological resources.

Mitigation: Monitor all grading for paleontological resources

Monitoring: Monitor all grading

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Definitions for Land Use Suitability Ratings

Where indicated below, the appropriate Land Use Suitability Rating(s) has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable S - Generally Suitable PS - Provisionally Suitable
 U - Generally Unsuitable R - Restricted

a. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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

Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

A-P Zones NA PS U R

CFH Zones NA PS U R

Source: CGP Fig. VI.1 - VI.3

Findings of Fact: The proposed project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

11. Liquefaction Potential Zone

Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

NA S PS U R

Source: CGP Fig. VI.4

Findings of Fact: The proposed project is located in an area that has been identified as having potential for liquefaction in the event of an earthquake. The project is a normal-low risk land use, is in ground shaking zone I, and is in recent alluvium with groundwater deeper than 10 feet. Normal-low risk land uses are provisionally suitable in this type of area with a moderate liquefaction risk. According to Figure VI.4, a project that is provisionally suitable requires a site investigation and/or. Given the proposed structures, a geotechnical report addressing potential liquefaction hazards should be prepared in compliance with the California Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 117 and reviewed by the County Geologist.

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

Mitigation: As required by the geotechnical report.

Monitoring: As required by the geotechnical report.

12. Groundshaking Zone

Strong seismic ground shaking?

NA S PS U R

Source: CGP Fig. VI.5

Findings of Fact: According to the CGP the proposed recreational project is a normal-low risk use located within Zone I Groundshaking Zone.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None Required

13. Landslide Risk

Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?

NA S PS U R

Source: Riv. Co. 800 Scale Seismic Maps or On-site Inspection, CGP Fig. VI.6

Findings of Fact: The project site is very flat and the proposed lagoon will be built with slopes no greater than 2 to 1.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

14. Ground Subsidence

Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?

Source: Resolution No. 94-125

Findings of Fact: This issue will be addressed by the same geotechnical report that addresses the liquefaction potential on the site. However, a review of the soils types on site and the fact that it is so near the Colorado River determined that the possibility of ground subsidence is low.

Mitigation: As required by the geotechnical report.

Monitoring: As required by the geotechnical report.

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

15. Other Geologic Hazards

Such as seiche, mudflow or volcanic hazard?

Source: County Geologist

Findings of Fact: Consultation with the office of the County Geologist determined that there is no risk of seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard occurring on the site.

Mitigation:

Monitoring:

b. Would the project:

16. Slopes

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

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

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

Source: Riv. Co. 800 Scale Slope Maps

Findings of Fact: The project site is very flat. Very little grading will be required to prepare the area for the campground expansion. Grading will not effect any subsurface disposal system.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

17. Soils

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

b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Source: U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys

Findings of Fact:

a) All standard procedures to prevent topsoil loss or erosion will be followed during construction.

b) According to the USDA soil survey, the proposed project is located in an area consisting primarily of the Rositas-Gilman soil association. This soil association has a low shrink/swell potential.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

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

18. Erosion

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Change deposition, siltation or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys

Findings of Fact:

a) See 17a above. The type of project, coupled with the soil type and flat topography on site will prevent additional deposition, siltation, or erosion from impacting the Colorado River.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Source: CGP Fig. VI 1-VI.2, Ord. 460, Sec. 14.2 & Ord. 484

Findings of Fact: The project site is not within a blowsand area.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: CGP, project proposal

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

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed campground and lagoon are not uses that entail the use of hazardous chemicals.
- b) See 20a above.
- c) The proposed project will not interfere with an emergency response plan and/or emergency evacuation plan. The site is accessed by a paved, County maintained road, allowing for access by emergency response vehicles and personnel.
- d) See 20a above.
- e) The project site is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
21. Airports				
a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Fig. II.18.2-II.18.4, II.18.8-II.18.10 & IV.27-IV.36

Findings of Fact: The project site is located outside the airport influence area for the Blythe Airport, is not within two miles of a private airstrip, and is not located within the flight paths of planes traveling to/from airports further from the site.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
22. Hazardous Fire Area				
Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Fig. VI.30 - VI.31

Findings of Fact: The project site is not within a hazardous fire area. It is located within a rural area but the vegetation type native to this area is sparse due to the minimal rainfall and is not conducive to wildfires.

Mitigation: None required

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

Monitoring: None required

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project

23. Water Quality Impacts

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

Source: CGP, FEMA

Findings of Fact:

- The project will maintain existing drainage patterns on the project site. The project will not alter the course of any streams as none occur on site. Similarly, the project will not alter the course of the Colorado River, which lies directly to the east of this project and is accessed directly by boats and swimmers through the project site. During the construction period the project will comply with all state and federal guidelines for construction period discharges.
- The only impervious surfaces created by this project will be the paved access roads within the project site.
- The existing park has its own well and uses an average of 2000 gallons every 24 hours. This water is used for both irrigation and by the campground patrons and camp hosts. The property purchased for expansion came with water rights from the Colorado River. The project will have plenty of water for its needs without depleting local supplies.
- There are no planned or existing storm drain facilities in this area. The proposed project will not create substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
- No permanent housing will be constructed. This is a recreational facility and all occupants of the campground will be temporary and will occupy their own tents, campers, or recreational vehicles.
- Very few structures are planned for the project site. The main structure will be the camp store/recreation center. This and any other minor structures planned will not impede the 100 year flood plain of the Colorado River in this area.

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

g) The proposed project will not substantially degrade water quality.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: none required

24. Floodplains

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

NA - Not Applicable U - Generally Unsuitable R - Restricted

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Fig. VL7 & CGP Fig. VL8

Findings of Fact:

a) The project will maintain existing on-site and off-site drainage patterns. The only additional paving will occur on interior roads. The rest of the site will not be surfaced and will continue to be able to absorb surface runoff, including the minimal additional surface runoff from the paved roads.

b) See "a" above

c) The proposed project is located adjacent to the Colorado River and is within the 100 year flood plain and a dam inundation area.

d) This project will not measurably increase runoff from the project site. It will not change the amount of surface water in any water body.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

25. Land Use

a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Planning Department

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

Findings of Fact:

a) This project is a remodel/upgrade and an expansion of an existing park. The uses planned for the park will remain the same as they are, only at an expanded level. This will not create a substantial alteration of the present land use in the area.

b) This project is not within a city sphere of influence.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

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

Source: CGP, Planning Department

Findings of Fact:

a) County zoning ordinance 348 allows public uses such as parks in any zone.

b) Zoning surrounding the project site is R-R. The existing and proposed park is compatible with this zoning, which allows a variety of uses.

c) Surrounding land uses include single family residences to the south, agricultural uses to the north and west and the Colorado River to the east. This park is designed to offer recreation on the Colorado River. No other uses of the agricultural land to the north and west are planned at this time. This use is compatible with the existing and planned land uses in the area.

d) The CGP land use policies for this area do not go into great detail. They mention the fact that agriculture will remain a dominant land use in the Blythe area. This project will not change that. It will use land in a designated specific plan in a way that is not consistent with that plan. However, that plan has been in place since 1983 and has never been built. As currently envisioned, this project is consistent with all applicable policies in the CGP.

e) Except for the residences to the south, the area in question is sparsely populated. This project will not disrupt or divide any established community.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: none required

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

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

27. Mineral Resources

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: CGP Fig. VI.41-VI.42

Findings of Fact: The project site does not contain a known mineral resource, is not located within an area that has been classified or designated as a mineral resource area by the State Mining and Geology Board, is not designated as a locally important mineral resource recovery area, does not have an existing surface mine, and is not located near a mineral resource area or surface mine.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

NOISE Would the project result in

Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings

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

NA - Not Applicable A - Generally Acceptable B - Conditionally Acceptable

C - Generally Unacceptable D - Land Use Discouraged

28. Airport Noise

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

NA A B C D

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

NA A B C D

Source: CGP Fig. II.18.5, II.18.11 & VI.12/1984 AICUZ Report, M.A.F.B.

Findings of Fact: The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport.

Mitigation: None required

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

Monitoring: None required

29. Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

Source: CGP Fig. VI.11, VI.13 - VI.16

Findings of Fact: The only railroad noise source identified for the Palo Verde Valley by the CGP is the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad. This line runs generally north/south and is located a number of miles to the west of the project site. Therefore, the project site is not impacted by railroad noise.

Mitigation: None needed

Monitoring: None needed

30. Highway Noise

NA A B C D

Source: CGP Fig. VI.11, VI.17 - VI.29

Findings of Fact: No highways or freeways are located near the project site. The proposed project will not be impacted by this type of noise.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

31. Other Noise

NA A B C D

Source: CGP Fig. VI.11

Findings of Fact: There are no other noise sources in the area.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

32. Noise Effects on or by the Project

a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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

c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Fig. VL11

Findings of Fact: a-d) The existing campground has established rules which require quiet between the hours of 10 pm and 8 am. These rules will apply to the expansion area as well. The expanded lagoon area is located in the middle of the park and so will not impact residents to the south.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

33. Housing

a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Park District

Findings of Fact:

- a) The current use of the land in question is campground, park, and farmland. No homes will be displaced.
- b) It is anticipated that the expanded campground will function with the same staff as currently runs the District's existing campground. If additional staff are needed they will come from the existing population. This project will not generate a need for additional workers that do not already live in the Blythe area.
- c) See "a" above.
- d) The project is not within a redevelopment area.
- e) This project does not propose permanent dwelling units and therefore will not increase the population of the area.
- f) See "b" above

Mitigation: None required

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

Monitoring: None required

PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services.

34. Fire Services

Source: CGP Fig. IV.16-IV.18

Findings of Fact: Outside the City of Blythe the Palo Verde Valley is still rural and sparsely populated. People using the Mayflower campground are looking for a non urban recreational experience along the Colorado River. The nearest fire station is in the City of Blythe. According to the Riverside County GIS, the project site is not located within a hazardous fire area. The existing park has stand pipes in place for fire fighting purposes. All staff on site must have CPR and life guard training. At least one staff member is trained in swift water rescue. Fire fighting equipment including hoses, pumps, and a response vessel (boat) are on site.

Mitigation: New staff will be will have lifeguard and CPR training

Monitoring: None required

35. Sheriff Services

Source: CGP Fig. IV.17-IV.18

Findings of Fact: Sheriff's services will be provided by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. The District will consult with the Sheriff's Department about our proposed park master plan. Three staff members are penal code trained and certified.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

36. Schools

Source: CGP Fig. IV.17-IV.18

Findings of Fact: The proposed project is a recreational use and does not propose any permanent dwelling units. Therefore, it will not impact student populations or cause the need for additional school facilities.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

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

37. Libraries

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

Source: CGP Fig. IV.17-IV.18

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will not include any permanent housing and will be occupied by temporary campers only. Therefore, it will not impact library services.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

38. Health Services

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

Source: CGP Fig. IV.17-IV.18

Findings of Fact: The park is within half an hour of a response team. All staff are trained in CPR and first aid kits are placed throughout the park.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

RECREATION

39. Parks and Recreation

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

b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

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

Source: CGP Fig. IV.19-IV.20, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35, Ord. No. 659

Findings of Fact: This project is a recreational project itself and so will not cause the need for or adversely impact other recreational facilities. The project is not located within a C.S.A. or park and recreation district.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

40. Recreational Trails

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

Source: CGP Fig. IV.19-IV.24, Riv. Co. 800 Scale Equestrian Trail Maps, Open Space and Conservation Map for

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

Western County trail alignments

Findings of Fact: There are no recreational trail proposed for the area of the project. If trails should be proposed in the future, they could be incorporated into the park.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

41. Circulation

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

Source: CGF Fig. IV.1-IV.11

Findings of Fact:

a,c,f,g.) The proposed expanded park will have 160 camp sites and 7 employees. The road that leads to the park also is used by the residents living in the residential area to the south of the park. These are the two highest intensive uses in the area and the surrounding land is used primarily for agricultural production. Because this is a rural area the roads have very little traffic on them. The increase in traffic going to and from the park will have very little impact on the surrounding road system. Traffic patterns will not change.

b) Each camping space will have its own parking. Additional parking will be included near the camp store and campground office.

d,e) This facility is appeals to people who travel and camp in recreational vehicles or tents. It does not and will not

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

impact air traffic. It is not near a rail line and will not impact rail traffic. The Colorado River does not support commercial waterborne traffic.

h) There will be an increase in construction traffic during the construction phase of this project. Considering the temporary nature of such activity and the nature of traffic circulation in the area, the effect on traffic in the area will be minor.

i) This project will not impact existing emergency access into the area.

j) Mayflower Park is not on an existing bus line. A planned bike route along the Colorado River will not be impacted by this project. If it is built it can be incorporated into the park at that time

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

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

Source: CGP Fig. IV.12-IV.3

Findings of Fact: The CGP shows a proposed bike trail along the Colorado River. This project will not preclude the construction of that trail at any point in the future.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

43. Water

a) Requires or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

Source: CGP Fig. IV.14 - IV.15

Findings of Fact:

a,b) This project is located within the Palo Verde Irrigation District but will be serviced by well. The property purchased by the District for the park expansion also comes with river water rights. The park will have sufficient water supplies to service its needs. No new water treatment facilities will be needed.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

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

44. Sewer

a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Fig. IV.14

Findings of Fact:

- a) A new septic system will be needed for the expansion area. The existing septic system operates with no problems.
- b) There is no wastewater treatment provider in this area.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

45. Solid Waste

a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Fig. IV.17-IV.18

Findings of Fact: The District currently contracts with a waste hauling company to dispose of the park's trash and will continue to do so. The trash is hauled to the Blythe Landfill.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

46. Utilities

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

a) Electricity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

g) Other governmental services?

h) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?

Source: CGP Fig. IV.25-IV.26

Findings of Fact:

a,b,e) This project will require only limited extensions of onsite facilities to accommodate the planned park expansion.

d,e) Storm water drainage facilities and street lighting are not currently provided in the area.

f) The additional traffic will not be at a volume that will require additional road maintenance.

g) This project does not create a permanent population of residents who would need governmental services.

h) this project incorporates such energy conservation measures as solar lighting. It will not conflict with energy conservation plans.

Mitigation: None required

Monitoring: None required

OTHER

47. Other:

Source:

Findings of Fact:

Mitigation:

Monitoring:

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Source: CGP, project proposal, above checklist

Findings of Fact: The riparian habitat on site will not be disturbed.

	Less than		
Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation incorporated	Less Than Significant impact	No Impact

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

Source:CGP, project proposal, above checklist

Findings of Fact: Based on this checklist, all impacts will be mitigated to a level of less than significant. There will be no long or short term impacts.

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

Source:CGP, project proposal, above checklist

Findings of Fact: Based on the checklist, the moderate size of the proposed project, and the area where the proposed project is located, there will not be any cumulative impacts.

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

Source:CGP, project proposal, above checklist

Findings of Fact: Based on the above checklist, this project does not have environmental effects that will have adverse impacts on human beings, directly or indirectly.

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. California Code of Regulations, Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

Earlier Analyses Used, if any: None.

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

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER

P.O. Box 1409
4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

Mitigation

Monitoring

Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party/Monitoring Party	Implement Stage	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Project is located within an area that has been identified in the County General Plan as having the potential for liquefaction during an earthquake.	Subsurface geotechnical investigation will be performed on an as-needed basis to determine site-specific liquefaction susceptibilities. Soil and/or construction remediation will be performed to the satisfaction of a registered geologist.	Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District	A geotechnical investigation dated July 11, 2003 was performed by Southland Geotechnical, Inc. They determined that the potential for liquefaction is low and no mitigation is required.	Impacts determined not to be significant.

Response to Comments for Environmental Assessment 38521

Comment #1 John and Marilyn Norris 4/13/02 Via email

Our only concern about the expansion of Mayflower Park is will the entrance off Colorado River Road be left open? We really hope that it will be....

Response: The entrance to the park off of Colorado River Road will not be closed. This project will keep that as the main entrance to the park.

Comment # 2 Thomas L. Freeman, Executive Officer, Office of the Sheriff 4/9/02 Via email

You may wish to contact Captain Dan Ison, Commander, Blythe Sheriff Station, for additional comments.

Response: District staff spoke to Captain Ison on April 28th, 2003. He did not have any comments or concerns with our project.

The expansion of the park may result in increased calls for service to Mayflower Park. This may impact the timeliness to calls for service in the unincorporated area around the city of Blythe and the Palo Verde Valley.

Response: Captain Ison said that our existing park does not generate many calls for the Blythe Sheriff Substation. He did not have any comments or concerns with our project.

From: <Nanaelley@aol.com>
To: <KJJOHNSO@co.riverside.ca.us>
Date: 4/13/02 2:17PM
Subject: Enviromental Assesment #38521

We own two pieces of property (5311 and 5233) on Colorado River Road in Blythe.

Our only concern about the expansion of Mayflower Park is will the entrance off Colorado River Road be left open? We really hope that it will be as we walk daily in the summer to the park to enjoy the lagoon and to launch our see-dogs and boat. It is handy when the cell phones don't work to be able to walk to the park and use the pay phones there. Please do not allow them to close the entrance off Colorado River Road.

Thank you.

John and Marilyn Norris

From: Tom Freeman
To: Johnson, Kim
Date: 4/9/02 2:12PM
Subject: Response to Environmental Assessment No. 38521, Mayflower park

April 9, 2002

To: Ms. Kim J. Johnson
Assistant Park Planner

Fr: Tom Freeman
Executive Officer

SJ: Support for Mayflower Park Project

Please be advised that the Sheriff's Department supports the expansion of Mayflower Park, North Palo Verde Zoning Area, as submitted. Additionally, you may wish to contact Captain Dan Ison, Commander, Blythe Sheriff's Station, to seek additional comments from the captain. Sheriff Smith and Sheriff-elect Doyle have asked me to express our support of the proposed project.

As you know, the expansion of the park may result in increased calls for service to Mayflower Park. This may impact the timeliness to calls for service in the unincorporated area around the city of Blythe and the Palo Verde Valley.

For Sheriff Larry D. Smith,

Thomas L. Freeman
Executive Officer
Office of the Sheriff

RIVERSIDE COUNTY
REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN-SPACE DISTRICT

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

TO:
 Office of Planning and Research (OPR)
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814
 County Clerk
County of Riverside

FROM:
Riverside County Regional Park and
Open-Space District
4600 Crestmore Road
Riverside CA 92509

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

Mayflower Park Expansion EA # 38521
Project Title Case Numbers

Kim Jarrell Johnson (909)955-6515
State Clearinghouse Number Contact Person Area Code/No./Ext.

Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District, 4600 Crestmore Road, Riverside CA 92509
Project Applicant/Property Owner and Address


Six miles northeast of Blvde. off of 6th Ave. at the end of Colorado River Road in Section 12, T6S, R23E
Project Location

Add 62 acres to existing park, improve acreage with 72 camping spaces, laundry facilities, new camp store and recreation room.
Project Description

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

1. The project will, will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the project and certified pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.
 A Negative Declaration was prepared for the project pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.
3. Mitigation Measures were, were not made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. Findings were made in accordance with Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations was, was not adopted for the project.
6. A de minimis finding was, was not made for the project in accordance with Section 7114 of the California Fish and Game Code.

This is to certify that the Negative Declaration or Final EIR, with comments, responses and record of project approval is available to the general public at the Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space District Headquarters, 4600 Crestmore Road, Riverside CA 92509


Signature
F:\USER\KIMJOHNSON\06-09-06

Parks Director
Title

Date

TO BE COMPLETED BY OPR
Date Received for Filing and
Posting at OPR:

FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY

Please charge deposit fee case #:

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
CERTIFICATE OF FEE EXEMPTION

De Minimis Impact Finding

Project Title/Location: Mayflower Park Remodel and Expansion

Mayflower Park is located along the Colorado River, six miles northeast of Blythe, off of 6th Avenue at the end of Colorado River Road in Section 12, T6S, R23E.

Project Description: Mayflower Park is an existing 24 acre park, built on property purchased in 1967. It was designed to provide the residents of Riverside County with recreational opportunities along the Colorado River. Mayflower Park currently has 88 camping spaces, boat launching facilities for the river, and a swim lagoon. An additional 62 acres on the north and west side of the park have been purchased to expand the park. In the expansion area the Parks Department plans to add 72 additional camping spaces.

Findings of Exemption: An Initial Study has been prepared by the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District and the Riverside County Planning Department for the project described in Environmental Assessment No. 38521, to evaluate the potential for adverse impacts.

The Initial Study concluded that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and that there is no evidence before the Board of Supervisors that the proposed project will have a potential for adverse effects on wildlife resources. The Initial Study found that there are no wildlife resources on the site because a portion of the site is currently a developed campground and the rest of the site is farmland that has been under cultivation.

Certification:

I hereby certify that the public agency has made the above finding and that the project will not individually or cumulatively have an adverse effect on wildlife resources, as defined in Section 711.2 of Fish and Game Code.


Paul Frandsen, Director, Riverside County Parks Department

Title: Director
Lead Agency: Riverside County Parks Department
Date: October 16, 2003

*Waters of California
DIP # 26*

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - THE RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
ENVIRONMENTAL FILING FEE CASH RECEIPT

Receipt # 200301146

Lead Agency: RIVERSIDE COUNTY REGIONAL PARK & OPEN SPACE DISTRICT Date: 11/05/2003

County Agency of Filing: Riverside Document No: 200301146

Project Title: EA 38521; MAYFLOWER PARK EXPANSION

Project Applicant Name: RIVERSIDE COUNTY REGIONAL PARK & OPEN SPACE Phone Number: _____

Project Applicant Address: 4600 CRESTMORE RD. RIVERSIDE CA 92509

Project Applicant: Special District

CHECK APPLICABLE FEES:

- Environmental Impact Report _____
- Negative Declaration _____
- Application Fee Water Diversion (State Water Resources Control Board Only) _____
- Project Subject to Certified Regulatory Programs _____
- County Administration Fee \$64.00
- Project that is exempt from fees (De Minimis Exemption)
- Project that is exempt from fees (Notice of Exemption)

Total Received \$64.00



Signature and title of person receiving payment: _____

Notes:

RIVERSIDE COUNTY

REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN-SPACE DISTRICT

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

TO: Office of Planning and Research (OPR)
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

FROM: **FILED**
RIVERSIDE COUNTY
NOV 05 2003
GARY L. ORSO
By: *C. Kohler* C. Kohler
Deputy

County Clerk
County of Riverside

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

Original Negative Declaration/Notice of Determination was routed to County Clerks for posting on.
OCT 30 2003

<u>Mayflower Park Expansion</u>	<u>EA # 38521</u>	
<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Case Numbers</i>	
<u>State Clearinghouse Number</u>	<u>Kim Jarrell Johnson</u>	<u>(909)955-6515</u>
	<i>Contact Person</i>	<i>Area Code/No./Ext.</i>
<u>Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District, 4600 Crestmore Road, Riverside CA 92509</u>		
<i>Project Applicant/Property Owner and Address</i>		
<u>Six miles northeast of Blythe, off of 6th Ave. at the end of Colorado River Road in Section 12, T6S, R23E.</u>		
<i>Project Location</i>		

Add 62 acres to existing park, improve acreage with 72 camping spaces, laundry facilities, new camp store and recreation room.
Project Description

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

1. The project will, will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the project and certified pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.
 A Negative Declaration was prepared for the project pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.
3. Mitigation Measures were, were not made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. Findings were made in accordance with Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations: was, was not adopted for the project.
6. A de minimis finding was, was not made for the project in accordance with Section 7114 of the California Fish and Game Code.

This is to certify that the Negative Declaration or Final EIR, with comments, responses and record of project approval is available to the general public at the Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space District Headquarters, 4600 Crestmore Road, Riverside CA 92509

<i>Paul Franzen</i>	Parks Director	Date
<i>Raquel Rosete</i>	Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors	10/28/03
Signature Raquel Rosete	Title	Date
		13.1

COUNTY CLERK
Neg. Declaration/Notice of Determination
Filed per P.R.C. 21152
POSTED

TO BE COMPLETED BY OPR Date Received for Filing and Posting at OPR:	FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY Please charge deposit fee case #:	NOV 05 2003 DEC 06 2003 Removed: _____ By: <i>C. Kohler</i> Dept. County of Riverside, State of California
--	--	--

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
CERTIFICATE OF FEE EXEMPTION

De Minimis Impact Finding

Project Title/Location: Mayflower Park Remodel and Expansion
Mayflower Park is located along the Colorado River, six miles northeast of Blythe, off of 6th Avenue at the end of Colorado River Road in Section 12, T6S, R23E.

Project Description: Mayflower Park is an existing 24 acre park, built on property purchased in 1967. It was designed to provide the residents of Riverside County with recreational opportunities along the Colorado River. Mayflower Park currently has 88 camping spaces, boat launching facilities for the river, and a swim lagoon. An additional 82 acres on the north and west side of the park have been purchased to expand the park. In the expansion area the Parks Department plans to add 72 additional camping spaces

Findings of Exemption: An Initial Study has been prepared by the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District and the Riverside County Planning Department for the project described in Environmental Assessment No. 38521, to evaluate the potential for adverse impacts.

The Initial Study concluded that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and that there is no evidence before the Board of Supervisors that the proposed project will have a potential for adverse effects on wildlife resources. The Initial Study found that there are no wildlife resources on the site because a portion of the site is currently a developed campground and the rest of the site is farmland that has been under cultivation.

Certification:

I hereby certify that the public agency has made the above finding and that the project will not individually or cumulatively have an adverse effect on wildlife resources, as defined in Section 711.2 of Fish and Game Code.



Paul Frandsen, Director, Riverside County Parks Department

Title: Director
Lead Agency: Riverside County Parks Department
Date: October 16, 2003

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

February 19, 2010

Riverside County
Board of Supervisors
4080 Lemon Street
Riverside CA 92501

Re: February 23, 2010, 1:30 hearing; item 13.1; Allocation of Development Impact Fees.

Board Members:

The February 18, 2010, Press Enterprise stated that the indictment of four San Jacinto City Council members may affect the city's ability to apply for federal funding.(attached)

The article states that the four council members are suspended from participating in federally funded programs and project of the Federal Highway Administration in accordance with federal regulations while the criminal case is pending.

Has County Counsel reviewed this agenda item to determine whether the indictments of the San Jacinto Council members, who may have voted to go forward with the San Jacinto River Levee, Stage 4, , prevents this allocation of Development Impact Fees, under federal, state or county law.

Because of the recent indictments in San Bernardino County and in the City of San Jacinto with millions of dollars in taxpayer funds being stolen, we think that every agenda item such as this should be given extra scrutiny.

Sincerely,

Susan Nash
Board Member.

07:35 AM PST on Thursday, February 18, 2010

By GAIL WESSON

The Press-Enterprise

Special Section: San Jacinto Corruption Probe

San Jacinto and some regional governments are notifying federal agencies about the indictment of four City Council members and the fallout may affect the city's ability to apply for federal funds in the future.

Only one agency, the Riverside County Transportation Commission, has received a response to its letter, but the San Jacinto city attorney says that foreshadows what's ahead.

The letter directed to the four individual council members accused in a political corruption probe states that they are suspended from participating in federally funded programs and projects of the Federal Highway Administration in accordance with federal regulations while the criminal case is pending.

"This action is remedial in nature and not for the purpose of punishment ... It has been undertaken to protect the public interest by ensuring that the (agency) conducts business only with presently responsible persons," the letter, dated Jan. 27, states.

Jeff Ballinger, the contract city attorney, said in his opinion this action does not put at risk past federal project awards, but will mean "the city cannot apply for future federal dollars."

From transportation to law enforcement and community development grants, "Those types of funds could not come to the city while we have the majority of the board members indicted for these types of offenses," he said.

Interim City Manager Tim Hults is not aware of any potential projects that would require a federal funds application in the next fiscal year, he wrote in an e-mail.

The city still expects reimbursement for previous projects that relied on some federal funding. One example is a three-year federal community development block grant funneled through Riverside County for installation of downtown sidewalks.

The suspension "is not supposed to be applied retroactively from our understanding," on federal funding, said John Standiford, the transportation commission deputy executive director. But the commission's executive director did suggest to Hults that if someone on the suspension list continued to serve on the commission "we could have federal funding cut off to our agency," Standiford said by phone.

The four council members previously declined to resign while charges are pending. Mayor Dale Stubblefield and councilmen John Mansperger and Jim Potts echoed each other Wednesday in saying in the criminal justice system someone is considered innocent until proven guilty.

Mansperger said of Councilman Steve Di Memmo, "He's the one beating the drum, trying to get that federal funding suspended."

Ballinger said Di Memmo brought the federal regulations to his attention.

"The federal government doesn't want to take the chance of tax dollars being misappropriated, that's what this is about," said Di Memmo, who spent 20 years in federal investigative and law enforcement work, including a stint as a U.S. Treasury special agent.

Stubblefield said if the city was forced to pay back any money, "I certainly wouldn't want the taxpayers to have to pay for me to be in office."

Because of the federal regulations, Stubblefield recommended in January that Di Memmo serve as the city representative to regional boards that rely on federal funding, replacing Jim Ayres and Potts.

Reach Gail Wesson at 951-763-3455 or gwesson@PE.com

Fallout from San Jacinto council indictments

Committee appointments: Mayor Dale Stubblefield with council consent appointed the only unindicted council member, Steve Di Memmo, to represent the city on four regional commissions to avoid jeopardizing their federal funds.

Notification letters: The city notified five federal programs of the criminal indictments; Riverside Transit Agency and Riverside County Transportation Commission each wrote one letter, and Riverside County will be writing one letter.

The response: The transportation commission was notified by the Federal Highway Administration that the four may not participate in federally funded programs and projects. Other agencies are awaiting responses.

The consequences: City Attorney Jeff Ballinger said this should not affect past grants or actions, but the city will not be able to apply for future federal grants. City officials say no applications are anticipated this year.