

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: EIR 433, Section V.C.3, "Hydrology, Flooding and Drainage;" EIR 433, Section V.C.6, "Water Quality;" EIR 433, Section V.D.2, "Water and Sewer Services;" EIR 433 Appendix C "Hydrologic Analysis" (BAW Civil Engineering, 2002); Preliminary Specific Water Quality Management Plan (MDS, 2012); Preliminary Hydrology Report (MDS, 2012); FEMA Map Viewer (accessed July 11, 2012); Conditions of Approval for SP 325A1 & TR36390; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) As disclosed in EIR 433, and further detailed in the hydrology technical report prepared for TR 36390 (MDS, 2012) the Citrus Heights property accepts storm water runoff flows from an approximately 1,284-acre tributary area south and east of the property. Under existing conditions, storm water runoff flows are captured by natural drainage courses and are directed north through the central portion of the Citrus Heights property toward the Harrison Dam, an earthen fill dam owned and operated by the Riverside County Flood Control and Conservation District that occupies a parcel that is surrounded by the Citrus Heights property but is not a part of either SP 325 or the proposed Project. The Harrison Dam temporarily stores storm water runoff flows during peak storm events before discharging flows to the north, where they traverse the Citrus Heights property and are ultimately discharged off-site towards the northwest.

Similar to approved SP 325, the proposed Project is designed to preserve the natural drainage courses that traverse the Citrus Heights property within open space areas. Storm water flows

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

originating from off-site areas would be conveyed via these natural drainage courses and culverts (at roadway crossings) consistent with historic drainage flow patterns. Storm water runoff from developed portions of the Citrus Heights property would be captured by a subsurface storm drain system installed beneath on-site roadways. First flush storm water flows would be routed to one of three (3) water quality/detention basins on-site for water quality treatment. From the water quality/detention basins, storm water flows would be discharged in close proximity to historic flow locations into the natural drainage courses within on-site open space areas. Runoff in excess of first flush flows would bypass the water quality/detention basins and would be discharged in close proximity to historic flow locations into one of the various natural drainage courses within on-site open space areas. Water quality treatment of runoff flows in excess of first flush flows would not be necessary, as first flush flows capture the majority of water-borne pollutants (including silt and sediment). The natural drainage courses that receive storm water runoff flows from developed portions of the Citrus Heights property (either directly or via the water quality/detention basins) would direct all flows to the Harrison Dam. The Harrison Dam would detain storm water flows during peak storm events and would discharge flows to the north consistent with historical drainage conditions. After discharge from the Harrison Dam, storm water flows would traverse the Citrus Heights property to the north via a natural drainage course and culvert (at roadway crossings) before being discharged from the northwest corner of the property.

With construction of the proposed storm water drainage system on the Citrus Heights property, the proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Citrus Heights property in any way that could result in substantial on- or off-site erosion. Additionally, the proposed Project would reduce the approved grading footprint of SP 325 by approximately 47 acres and limit the geographic extent where natural drainage patterns could be affected. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant erosion impacts associated with drainage pattern alteration than previously disclosed in EIR 433. Impacts associated with development of SP 325 would be less than significant, consistent with the finding of EIR 433.

Storm water drainage improvements would be installed within Street "A" to capture and convey storm water runoff with minimal alterations in existing flow patterns or flow rates. Alterations to existing flow patterns or flow rates caused by the construction of Street "A" are not expected to result in substantial erosion or siltation off-site. Furthermore, the proposed Project would reduce the approved grading footprint of Street "A" by approximately 10 acres, thereby reducing the extent where natural drainage conditions could be affected. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe erosion impacts associated with drainage pattern alteration than previously disclosed in EIR 433. Impacts associated with development of Street "A" would be less than significant, which is consistent with the finding of EIR 433.

b) Impacts to water quality were previously evaluated as part of EIR 433, which concluded that such impacts would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures identified as part of EIR 433 would continue to apply to the proposed Project, including proposed development on the Citrus Heights property and Street "A." Additionally, a site-specific Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) has been prepared for the Citrus Heights property. This site-specific Preliminary WQMP identifies measures that would be undertaken on the Citrus Heights property to preclude significant water quality impacts, including the incorporation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) into the design for the site. Compliance with the requirements of the site-specific Preliminary WQMP would be assured through standard County conditions of approval applied to TR36390. Accordingly, mandatory compliance with mitigation measures in EIR 433 and the provisions within the site-specific Preliminary WQMP prepared for TR 36390 would ensure the

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Project would meet water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, resulting in a less than significant impact. Furthermore, the proposed Project would increase the area on the Citrus Heights property reserved for water quality/detention basins, as compared to approved SP 325, to ensure that adequate water quality treatment facilities are provided on-site to preclude the violation of waste discharge standards or requirements. Impacts would be less than significant and no new or more severe significant impact would occur beyond those already identified as part of EIR 433.

c) The Project does not propose to use groundwater wells, and therefore would have no impact on groundwater levels due to groundwater extraction. A majority of the Citrus Heights property would be undeveloped and/or reserved for open space with permeable ground surfaces; and, the proposed Project would reduce the approved grading footprint of SP 325 by approximately 47 acres and would reduce the approved grading footprint for Street "A" by approximately 10 acres. As such the Project would allow for the natural infiltration of storm water runoff into the groundwater table and would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. As such, and consistent with the information disclosed in EIR 433, no substantial depletion of the groundwater supplies would occur with implementation of either approved SP 325 or the proposed Project and impacts would be less than significant.

d) Refer to responses 25.a) and 25.b), above.

e & f) As disclosed in EIR 433, no portion of the Project site is located within a designated 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the proposed Project has no potential to place housing or any structure within a 100-year flood hazard area that could impede or redirect flood flows. In addition, as discussed in Response 26.c), below, the Project would not place housing within the dam inundation area for Harrison Dam. No impact would occur.

g) The proposed Project would not degrade water quality in ways not previously mentioned above in response 25.b), above, or as previously disclosed in EIR 433. Furthermore, the proposed Project would eliminate the golf course from SP 325. Fertilizers and other chemicals (e.g., pesticides) are routinely used during golf course maintenance activities; therefore, the elimination of the golf course from SP 325 is expected to result in an overall improvement in the quality of storm water discharged from the Citrus Heights property.

h) The Project proposes to construct and operate three (3) water quality/detention basins on the Citrus Heights property. The basins are designed to filter and pass water into natural drainage courses, and ultimately, the regional drainage system. Water in the water quality/detention basins would not be stagnant and the basins are designed to fully discharge all storm water flows within 48 hours. Therefore, the proposed water quality/detention basins would not attract vectors or produce an adverse odor. Required maintenance of the basins as detailed in the Preliminary WQMP prepared for TR 36390 and required by County conditions of approval would preclude any potentially adverse conditions, and would be generally similar to the maintenance activities required for the ponds provided on the golf course in approved SP 325. Water quality BMPs typically associated with nuisance odors, such as water quality/detention basins, are not proposed for Street "A"; therefore, there is no potential for odors or vectors associated with Street "A." As such, a significant impact would not occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 433 are required. Mitigation Measures C.6-2 as specified in EIR 433 has been revised to reflect the elimination of the golf course as proposed by Amendment No. 1 to Specific Plan No. 325. All measures identified in EIR 433 to

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

mitigate impacts to hydrology and water quality, including Mitigation Measure C.6-2 as revised below, continue to apply to the proposed Project.

C.6-2 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall obtain a NPDES permit for residential development. The NPDES permit would require the applicant to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that incorporates the current Best Management Practices and Best Available Technologies (BMPs and BATs) for pollution and erosion/siltation control on the residential portions of the site. Examples of BMPs and BATs include, but are not limited to: energy dissipation structures and rip-rap at stormwater discharge points to stabilize flow and reduce velocities; placement of mulching on cleared or freshly seeded areas for erosion/sedimentation control; geotextiles and mats for erosion control during minor construction/improvement activities, storm drain inlet/outlet protection for siltation control; slope drains for erosion control; the use of low-water requirement vegetation in landscaping, selection of slope planting species with low fertilization requirements; and requiring permanent irrigation systems to be inspected on a regular basis and properly maintained.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 433.

26. Floodplains

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

NA - Not Applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	U - Generally Unsuitable <input type="checkbox"/>	R - Restricted <input type="checkbox"/>
a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: EIR 433, Section V.C.3, "Hydrology, Flooding and Drainage;" EIR 433 Appendix C "Hydrologic Analysis" (BAW Civil Engineering, 2002); Preliminary Hydrology Report (MDS, 2012); Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones;" Riverside County General Plan Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone;" Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan Figure 10 "Flood Hazards;" RCLIS; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) Similar to approved SP 325, the proposed the Project is designed to preserve the natural drainage courses that traverse the Citrus Heights property within open space areas. Storm water flows originating from off-site areas would be conveyed through the Citrus Heights property via these

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

natural drainage courses and culverts (at roadway crossings) consistent with historic drainage flow patterns. Storm water runoff from developed portions of the Citrus Heights property would be captured by a subsurface storm drain system installed beneath on-site roadways. First flush storm water flows would be routed to one of three (3) water quality/detention basins on-site for water quality treatment. From the water quality/detention basins, storm water flows would be discharged in close proximity to historic flow locations into the natural drainage courses within on-site open space areas provided on the Citrus Heights property. Runoff in excess of first flush flows would bypass the water quality/detention basins and would be discharged in close proximity to historic flow locations into the natural drainage courses within on-site open space areas provided on the Citrus Heights property. The natural drainage courses that receive storm water runoff flows from developed portions of the Citrus Heights property would direct flows toward the Harrison Dam. The Harrison Dam would detain storm water flows during peak storm events and would discharge flows to the north consistent with historical drainage conditions. After discharge from the Harrison Dam, storm water flows would traverse the Citrus Heights property to the north via a natural drainage course and culvert (at roadway crossing) before being discharged from the northwest corner of the subject property.

Similar to approved SP 325, retention basins are not proposed on the Citrus Heights property to attenuate runoff flow volumes originating from developed areas on-site to pre-development levels due to the proximity of the property to the Harrison Dam. Retention basins would delay the discharge of storm water flows into the Harrison Dam during peak storm events. If retention were proposed, storm water flows would be discharged into the Harrison Dam closer to the peak flow rate of the Dam, thereby potentially exposing areas on the Citrus Heights property and properties upstream to an increased risk of flooding.

With construction of the proposed storm water drainage system, the proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Citrus Heights property or change absorption rates in any way that could result in flooding on- or off-site. Furthermore, the proposed Project would reduce the grading footprint of SP 325 by approximately 47 acres, thereby providing a drainage condition (runoff patterns and absorption rate) that more closely resembles natural conditions than approved SP 325. Accordingly, the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to the hydrology of the Citrus Heights property, and impacts would be reduced as compared to those previously disclosed in EIR 433. No mitigation is required.

Storm water drainage improvements would be installed within Street "A" to capture and convey storm water runoff with minimal alterations in existing flow patterns or flow rates. The alterations to existing flow patterns or flow rates caused by the construction of Street "A" are not expected to substantially change the existing drainage patterns in the area or change absorption rates in any way that could result in flooding on- or off-site. Furthermore, the proposed Project would reduce the approved grading footprint of Street "A" by approximately 10 acres, thereby reducing the extent where natural drainage conditions could be affected. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe erosion impacts associated with drainage pattern alteration than previously disclosed in EIR 433. Impacts associated with development of Street "A" would be less than significant, which is consistent with the finding of EIR 433.

c) As disclosed in EIR 433, a portion of the Citrus Heights property is located within the Dam Inundation Area for Harrison Dam. The proposed alignment of Street "A" is not located within the Dam Inundation Area. EIR 433 concluded that flood hazard risks on the Citrus Heights property associated with the failure of the Harrison Dam would be less than significant because all areas on the subject property within the Dam Inundation Area would be retained as open space or located

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

within the golf course. Although the proposed Project includes a different land use design for the Citrus Heights property than what was evaluated in EIR 433, the proposed Project would reserve areas on the property within the Dam Inundation Area as open space. No homes or habitable structures would be constructed on the Citrus Heights property within the designated Dam Inundation Area. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of Harrison Dam. Consistent with the information disclosed in EIR 433, impacts would be less than significant. The Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than disclosed by EIR 433.

d) As discussed above in Responses 26.a) and 26.b), implementation of the proposed Project would not substantially alter the historical drainage patterns of the Citrus Heights property or the proposed Street "A" alignment; and, would reduce the grading footprint of SP 325 and Street "A" by approximately 47 acres and 10 acres, respectively, which retains the Project site's natural drainage pattern to a greater extent than disclosed in EIR 433. As concluded by EIR 433 and as substantiated by the hydrology report prepared for TR 36390 (MDS, 2012), implementation of the Project would not substantially alter the amount of surface water in downstream water bodies. Impacts would be less than significant, which is the same conclusion drawn by EIR 433.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

27. 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: SP 325; EIR 433, Section V.A, "General Plan Land Use Consistency Analysis;" Riverside County General Plan; City of Riverside General Plan; RCLIS; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site encompasses an approved specific plan (SP 325), which designates the Citrus Heights property for development with single-family residential land uses, a golf course, recreation facilities (golf club house and parks), and open space, and the proposed alignment of Street "A," a roadway designated as a Circulation Element facility by both the Riverside County and City of Riverside General Plans. As concluded in EIR 433, development of the Project would not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land uses in the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest area. Changes proposed on the Citrus Heights property as part of the Project involve the reconfiguration of residential land uses and recreation facilities within SP 325 and the elimination of the golf course and golf course club house. Proposed changes to the land uses within SP 325 would not comprise a "substantial alteration" of the present or planned land use of the area beyond what was already disclosed in EIR 433. Likewise, and as concluded in EIR 433, development of Street "A"

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

would not comprise a "substantial alteration" of the present or planned land uses in the area. As such, no impact would occur.

b) As disclosed in EIR 433, the Citrus Heights property is located within the City of Riverside Sphere of Influence. At the time EIR 433 was prepared, the City of Riverside had not applied any land use designations to the property, and EIR 433 concluded that implementation of the SP 325 would not conflict with the City of Riverside General Plan. As part of the City of Riverside's 2008 General Plan update, the "Hillside Residential" (HR, max. 0.5 dwelling units per acre) land use designation was applied to the Citrus Heights property. The proposed Project would develop the Citrus Heights property with a maximum of 1.03 dwelling unit per acre; therefore implementation of the Project would result in an effect to the planned land uses within the Sphere of Influence of Riverside. Although the proposed Project would exceed the density assigned by the City of Riverside's HR designation for the Citrus Heights property, no physical land use impacts would occur as a result of the inconsistency; therefore, a significant impact to the environment is not identified. The proposed Project also would involve the construction of Street "A," the alignment of which is partially located within unincorporated Riverside County and partially located within the City of Riverside. Street "A" is designated as a Circulation Element roadway by the City of Riverside General Plan; therefore, development of the Street "A" was already assumed by the City of Riverside and the proposed Project would result in the implementation of the City of Riverside General Plan Circulation Element. As such, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant environmental impacts associated with land use designation inconsistencies within a City Sphere of Influence or within City boundaries than disclosed by EIR 433.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

28. 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 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: EIR 433, Section V.A, "General Plan Land Use Consistency Analysis;" EIR 433, Section V.B, "Area Plan Land Use Consistency Analysis;" Riverside County General Plan; Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan; City of Riverside General Plan; RCLIS; El Sobrante Policy Area Consistency Memorandum (T&B Planning, 2013); Project Application Materials

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Findings of Fact:

a) The Citrus Heights property is zoned "Specific Plan" (SP) and development of the property is governed by the Zoning Ordinance for SP 325. The Project would modify the Zoning Ordinance for SP 325 to reflect the modifications proposed by SP 325A1. With approval of the proposed Project, there would be no inconsistency between the Citrus Heights property's zoning designation and no impact would occur. The proposed alignment of Street "A" traverses property in Riverside County zoned "Specific Plan" (SP) and "Residential Agriculture" (R-A) and property in the City of Riverside zoned Residential Agriculture (RA-5). Development of the proposed roadway would be consistent with these zoning designations and no impact would occur.

b) & c) The issues of land use and zoning compatibility were evaluated as part of EIR 433, which concluded that development of the Citrus Heights property as a master-planned residential community with a golf course would be compatible with surrounding land uses and zoning. There are no components of the proposed Project that would alter the conclusions of EIR 433 with respect to land use compatibility on the Citrus Heights property, as proposed revisions to SP 325 would replace the the golf course and club house land uses with open space land uses and would reconfigure and reprogram the residential portion of SP 325. The modifications proposed by the Project would not substantially alter the character of planned development on the Citrus Heights property and would not present a conflict with surrounding land uses and zoning. Similarly, development of Street "A", a County and City of Riverside Circulation Element roadway, also would not present a conflict with surrounding land uses and zoning. As such, a significant land use compatibility impact would not occur.

d) The Project proposes modifications to SP 325 to accommodate adjustments to the internal configuration of land uses within the Specific Plan area. With approval of the proposed Project, there would be no inconsistencies with SP 325. As disclosed in EIR 433, the proposed Project would be consistent with all applicable policies of the General Plan, including the applicable policies of the El Sobrante Policy area. In order for a policy inconsistency to be significant under CEQA, the inconsistency must result in a significant environmental effect. No component of the proposed Project would create a new or more severe inconsistency with any County General Plan policy and result in new or more severe impacts to the physical environment. Although the Project would utilize an additional 48 units above what was disclosed in EIR 433, such an increase would not be considered substantial because it would not directly exceed the 1,500 units allotted within the El Sobrante Policy Area by LMWAP Policy 1.1 and additional dwellings units would remain available for development on the remaining undeveloped portion of the El Sobrante Policy Area. Furthermore, the proposed Project would limit density on the Citrus Heights property to 1.03 dwelling units per acre (du/ac), which is only 0.03 du/ac and 10 dwelling units above a density of 1.0 du/ac that is characteristic of a rural lifestyle. The Project also would not degrade the level of service on local roads above levels disclosed in EIR 433 (see Response 43.a) below), in conformance with the intent of Policy LMWAP 1.1 to maintain a rural lifestyle in the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest area. Additionally, the Project would include the construction of a major infrastructure improvement for the benefit of all residents in the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest area (i.e., Street "A"), the construction of which is specifically called for by Policy LMWAP 1.1. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with LMWAP 1.1. The proposed Project also would be developed in coordination with local service providers and the City of Riverside (in conformance with LMWAP policies 1.3 and 1.4) and would include a Specific Plan with minimum residential pad sizes of 8,000 s.f. (in conformance with LMWAP policies 1.5 and 1.6). Furthermore, the Project would reduce the grading footprints of SP 325 and Street "A" by approximately 47 acres and 10 acres, respectively, to minimize effects to the natural topography (in conformance with

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

LMWAP policies 1.7, 1.8, and 1.9) and would provide over 169 acres of open space and recreational amenities (in conformance with LMWAP Policy 1.10). Accordingly, the Project would be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the General Plan, including the El Sobrante Policy Area, and SP 325 and a significant impact would not occur, similar to the conclusion of EIR 433.

e) The Project site is vacant and implementation of the proposed Project would not result in the physical disruption or division of any established communities. Further, the proposed Project would represent the continuation of an existing development pattern and would be consistent with the planned pattern of land uses within the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest area, as anticipated by the Riverside County General Plan and Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan. In addition, the Project would result in the construction of a roadway identified as a Circulation Plan facility by the Riverside County and City of Riverside General Plans. No impact would occur. This conclusion is consistent with the finding of EIR 433.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

29. Mineral Resources

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource 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: EIR 433, Section V.H.1, "Effects Found Not to be Significant;" Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area;" City of Riverside General Plan Figure OS-1 "Mineral Resources"

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) As disclosed in EIR 433, the Project site is not known to contain any mineral resources, and the Project site is not designated as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. No mineral resources have been discovered on the property since EIR 433 was certified in 2004 and no mineral resource mapping changes have been made to the site or the surrounding area; therefore, there has been no change in circumstance. Accordingly, and consistent with the information presented in EIR 433, no impacts to known mineral resources or locally-important mineral resource recovery sites would not occur associated with development of the Project site.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

c) & d) The proposed Project site is not located in close proximity to any existing surface mines, proposed surface mines, or abandoned quarries or mines. No mines on or around the subject property have been identified since EIR 433 was certified in 2004, so there has been no change in circumstance. Accordingly, there is no potential for the proposed Project to cause an incompatibility with or present a hazard to a mine or quarry. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is 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

30. Airport Noise

a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

NA A B C D

b) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

NA A B C D

Source: EIR 433, Section V.C.4, "Noise;" Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," Airport Master Records and Reports Database (accessed July 12, 2012); Google Earth (accessed July 12, 2012); RCLIS

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) Consistent with information disclosed in EIR 433, the Project site is not located within an airport influence area or within two miles of a public or private airport or airstrip. As such, the proposed Project could not expose people residing in the Project area to excessive noise levels associated with airports or airstrips. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

31. Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

Source: EIR 433, Section V.C.4, "Noise;" Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", Google Earth (accessed July 12, 2012); RCLIS

Findings of Fact:

The Project site is located over two miles from the nearest railroad corridor. Accordingly, consistent with the information disclosed in EIR 433, there is no potential for the Project to expose people residing in the Project area to excessive railroad noise.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

32. Highway Noise

NA A B C D

Source: EIR 433, Section V.C.4, "Noise;" Google Earth (accessed July 12, 2012); RCLIS

Findings of Fact:

The Project site is located over two miles from the nearest highway (State Route 91). Accordingly, consistent with the information disclosed in EIR 433, there is no potential for the Project to expose people residing in the Project area to excessive highway noise.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

33. Other Noise

NA A B C D

Source: EIR 433, Section V.C.4, "Noise;" Google Earth (accessed July 12, 2012); RCLIS

Findings of Fact:

EIR 433 did not disclose any other sources of noise that have the potential to expose people residing in the Project area to excessive noise. The proposed Project does not propose any noise sources that were not previously disclosed in EIR 433. Therefore, no other noise impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

34. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: EIR 433, Section V.C.4, "Noise;" Riverside County General Plan, Table N-1 ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure"); EIR 433 Technical Appendix D "Noise Impact Analysis" (Giroux, 2002); Traffic Study (Urban Crossroads, 2012); Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Alta, 2012); Blasting Analysis (REVEY, 2013) Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) As discussed in EIR 433, implementation of SP 325 would not cause significant, permanent increases to ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the subject property. EIR 433 found that project-related traffic noise, which would be the primary source of off-site noise associated with SP 325, would contribute no more than 1.8 dBA CNEL to any road segment in the vicinity of the subject property. Noise contributions of less than 3.0 dBA CNEL are considered less than significant because such noise changes would not represent a perceptible change to the noise environment.

The land uses proposed by the Project are less traffic intensive than what was evaluated in EIR 433. A trip generation analysis prepared for the proposed Project concluded that the Project would generate 212 fewer daily traffic trips than SP 325, and would therefore result in a concomitant decrease in off-site noise contributions, as compared to what was disclosed in EIR 433. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels, and impacts would be less than significant and less than those disclosed in EIR 433.

b) EIR 433 disclosed that construction activities on the Project site would result in substantial temporary or periodic increases to ambient noise levels, but that construction-related noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Construction activities proposed by the Project would be similar to what was evaluated in EIR 433 but would cover less of a geographic area and occur over a shorter time duration because the grading footprint for SP 325 and Street "A" would be reduced by approximately 47 acres and 10 acres, respectively, thereby reducing the extent of earthmoving and construction activities Project-wide. Mitigation measures specified in EIR 433 would continue to apply to the proposed Project, and

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

mandatory compliance with these mitigation measures would ensure that the proposed Project would not expose persons in the vicinity of the subject property to substantial temporary or periodic increases to ambient noise levels. Implementation of the Project would not result in any new or more severe construction-related noise impacts than were previously disclosed in EIR 433.

c) EIR 433 evaluated the potential for residential land uses within the Project area to result in, or be affected by, substantial adverse noise levels. As concluded in EIR 433, residential land uses in Planning Area 1 of the Specific Plan area could be exposed to noise levels exceeding County standards resulting from traffic along McAllister Street. To ensure that future residential land uses were not exposed to substantial noise levels, EIR 433 required noise attenuation mitigation measures. The mitigation measures identified in EIR 433 would continue to apply to the proposed Project and would be implemented in Planning Area 1. Although the proposed Project would locate more homes adjacent to McAllister Street than approved SP 325, mandatory compliance with required mitigation measures would ensure that the proposed Project would not expose persons to noise levels in excess of the standards established by the County General Plan or in excess of noise levels disclosed in EIR 433. Accordingly, Project-related noise impacts and required mitigation would not be greater than what was previously disclosed in EIR 433.

d) There are no conditions associated with the proposed Project that would result in the exposure of residents either on or off-site to new or more severe ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise impacts than would have occurred under approved SP 325 and previously disclosed in EIR 433. During construction of the proposed Project, the construction equipment likely to be used would be similar to the equipment fleet evaluated in EIR 433, and is not anticipated to produce significant amounts of ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. In addition, as disclosed in EIR 433, it is unlikely that potential blasting activities on the Citrus Heights property and in the alignment of Street "A" (if required) would produce a significant amount of ground-borne vibration beyond the boundary of the property. Additionally, because the grading footprints for SP 325 and Street "A" would be reduced by approximately 47 acres and 10 acres, respectively, the potential for construction-induced vibration would be less than disclosed in EIR 433. During long-term operation of the proposed Project, there are no uses proposed on the Citrus Heights property that would result in the generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. A blasting analysis was conducted for the Project by REVEY Associates in February 2013, which includes recommendations that will be followed during Project construction to preclude any significant impacts associated with vibration. Vehicular traffic along Street "A" is not expected to generate substantial ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels during long-term operation. Accordingly, Project-related impacts associated with ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels would be less than significant, and would have a lesser potential to occur than as disclosed in EIR 433.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 433 are required. All measures identified in EIR 433 to mitigate noise impacts continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 433.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
--	------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

35. 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: EIR 433, Section V.F, "Regional Element;" Western Riverside County Growth Forecasts 2010-2035 (accessed July 13, 2012); Riverside County Ordinance No. 460; Project Application Materials, RCLIS

Findings of Fact:

a) & c) As disclosed in EIR 433, no existing homes are located on the Project site. No homes have been constructed on the Project site since EIR 433 was certified in 2004; therefore, there has been no change in circumstance. Accordingly, and consistent with the information provided in EIR 433, development of the Project site either as approved by SP 325 or as proposed by the Project would not displace any existing housing and would not result in the need to construct replacement housing elsewhere. As concluded by EIR 433, no impact would occur.

b) The proposed Project seeks modifications approved SP 325 which, among other changes, proposes to increase the permitted number of residential homes on the Citrus Heights property from 295 homes to 343 homes and increase the range of lot sizes, providing more variety in housing choice. As with approved SP 325 and as disclosed by EIR 433, the proposed Project provides housing on a property (i.e., the Citrus Heights property) that is designated for residential use by the Riverside County General Plan. Development of the Citrus Heights property as proposed would not result in an increase in demand for affordable housing, which will be accommodated County-wide through implementation of Riverside County General Plan and as evaluated in the Riverside County General Plan EIR. Accordingly, and as concluded by EIR 433, no impact would occur.

d) EIR 433 did not disclose any redevelopment areas as being located on or near the Project site. According to the Riverside County GIS database, the proposed Project site is not located within or near any County Redevelopment Project Areas. Accordingly, the Project would have no affect on such areas.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
---	--	--	--

e) The Project site is located within the Southern California Association of Government's Western Riverside Subregion. EIR 433 evaluated potential conflicts with regional population projections and concluded that implementation of SP 325 would be consistent with projected future growth in the Western Riverside Subregion geographic area. As described in EIR 433, SCAG projected the population in the Western Riverside Subregion to increase by 794,319 people between the years 2000 and 2010. Based on census data, the population within the Western Riverside Subregion grew by 534,479 persons between 2000 and 2010, which is less than the 794,319 person increase projected by SCAG and assumed in the original analysis in EIR 433. Therefore, the development of 343 single-family homes on the Citrus Heights property (an increase of 48 homes as compared to approved SP 325) would have been well within the SCAG's growth projections for the Western Riverside Subregion.

The currently applicable regional population projections for Western Riverside County estimate that the population within the Western Riverside Subregion will grow by 732,638 persons between 2010 and 2035. Based on population projection rates contained within Riverside County Ordinance No. 460 (i.e., 2.59 persons per household), the proposed Project is expected to generate a total population of approximately 888 persons on the Citrus Heights property, which is an increase in 124 persons above what was evaluated in EIR 433. The additional 124 persons generated by the proposed Project would represent an approximately 0.02% increase in the projected 2035 population in the WRCOG geographic area. Such a slight increase is not considered substantial. Furthermore, population growth is not in and of itself an adverse environmental effect. The population growth would have to relate to a physical impact on the environment in order to be considered significant under CEQA. As documented throughout EIR 433 and this EIR Addendum, the proposed Project's anticipated population would directly or indirectly result in increased impacts to traffic, noise, air quality, and public services. Mitigation measures presented in EIR 433 would adequately reduce these significant environmental effects to less than significant levels. As such, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in substantially greater impacts to regional population than what was disclosed in EIR 433. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

f) The proposed Project seeks modifications to approved SP 325. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in a substantial inducement to population growth above what was already disclosed in EIR 433. The proposed Project would involve the extension of infrastructure as necessary to accommodate development within the SP 325 area, and such infrastructure would not result in substantial population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly. In addition, the proposed Project would result in the development of Street "A." Street "A" is identified as a Circulation Element facility by both the Riverside County and City of Riverside General Plans. As such, construction of this roadway can be reasonably expected to occur with or without the proposed Project. Accordingly, impacts associated with population inducement would not occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

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:

36. Fire Services

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.3, "Fire Services;" Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Impacts associated with fire protection services were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 433, which found that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels through the incorporation of mitigation measures. The mitigation measures identified in EIR 433 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. Although the proposed Project would slightly increase the population on the Citrus Heights property requiring fire protection services above what was evaluated in EIR 433, specified mitigation measures would be sufficient to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Neither approved SP 325 nor the proposed Project would result in the need to construct or physically alter fire stations to provide adequate service levels. Accordingly, with the implementation of required mitigation, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts to fire protection services than previously disclosed by EIR 433.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 433 are required. Mitigation Measures D.3-1, D.3-3, and D.3-4, as specified in EIR 433, have been revised to reference the currently applicable County ordinances, building codes, and reflect proposed SP 325A1. All measures identified in EIR 433 to mitigate impacts to fire protection services, including Mitigation Measures D.3-1, D.3-3, and D.3-4 as revised below, continue to apply to the proposed Project.

D.3-1 Prior to building permit final inspection, the applicant shall participate in the Riverside County Development Impact Fee Program (Ordinance No. 659), which provides funds that are used by the County to fund fire protection service facilities and operations in addition to other County services.

D.3-3 All structures on-site shall be constructed with fire retardant roofing material as described in the 2010 California Fire Code. Wood shingles shall not be allowed. Cul-de-sacs exceeding the maximum length allowed by Riverside County Ordinance No. 787 shall not be allowed.

D.3-4 Prior to building permit final inspection, the County shall conduct a field inspection to ensure that the fire suppression and landscape features specified on the Project's fuel management plan have been installed at appropriate distances from the structure(s), as detailed on a County-approved landscape plan.

- a. The required Fuel Modification Zones shall only be planted with those tree/plant species identified with a "FM" designation on the Specific Plan Plant Palette (see Table IV-2 of Specific Plan No. 325, Amendment No. 1).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in the revised Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program prepared for Addendum No. 1 to EIR 433.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

37. Sheriff Services

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.4, "Sheriff Services;" Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Impacts associated with sheriff services were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 433, which found that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels through the incorporation of mitigation measures. The mitigation measures identified in EIR 433 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. Although the proposed Project would slightly increase the population on the Citrus Heights property requiring sheriff protection services above what was evaluated in EIR 433, specified mitigation measures would be sufficient to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Neither approved SP 325 nor would the proposed Project result in the need to construct or physically alter sheriff's stations to provide adequate service levels. Accordingly, with the implementation of required mitigation, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts to sheriff services than previously disclosed by EIR 433.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 433 are required. Mitigation Measures D.4-1, as specified in EIR 433, has been revised to reference the currently applicable County ordinances. All measures identified in EIR 433 to mitigate impacts to sheriff protection services, including Mitigation Measure D.4-1 as revised below, continue to apply to the proposed Project.

D.4-1 Prior to building permit final inspection, Development Mitigation Fees shall be paid as outlined in the Riverside County Development Impact Fee Program (Ordinance No. 659). The fees are used by the County fund sheriff service facilities and operations in addition to other County services.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in the revised Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program prepared for Addendum No. 1 to EIR 433.

38. Schools

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.5, "Schools;" Project Application Materials; RCLIS

Findings of Fact: Impacts to school services were evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 433, which concluded that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures. The mitigation measures identified in EIR 433 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. The Riverside Unified School District plans for long-term facilities based on the land uses specified by the County and City of Riverside General Plan Land Use Plans. The Project proposes an increase in the total number of dwelling units within SP 325, from 295 dwelling units to 343 dwelling units, which would result in a concomitant increase in the number of school students the Project could generate that require school services. Using student generation rates contained in EIR 433, the proposed Project would generate 238 students (an increase of 32 students above what was disclosed in EIR 433). However, the slight increase in projected student population on the Citrus

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Heights property would not substantially increase impacts to school facilities beyond what was disclosed in EIR 433, and mitigation measures specified in EIR 433 would adequately reduce Project-related impacts to school services to less than significant levels. Neither approved SP 325 nor the proposed Project would result in the need to construct or physically alter school facilities to provide adequate service levels. Accordingly, with the implementation of required mitigation, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts to public school services than previously disclosed by EIR 433.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 433 are required. All measures identified in EIR 433 to mitigate impacts to public schools continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 433.

39. Libraries

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.9, "Libraries;" Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: Impacts to library services were evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 433, which concluded that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures. The mitigation measures identified in EIR 433 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. The Project proposes a slight increase in the total number of dwelling units within SP 325, from 295 dwelling units to 343 dwelling units, which would result in a concomitant increase in the Project's demand for library services. However, the slight increase in population on the Citrus Heights property would not substantially increase impacts to library facilities beyond what was disclosed in EIR 433, and mitigation measures specified in EIR 433 would adequately reduce Project-related impacts to library services to less than significant levels. Neither approved SP 325 nor the proposed Project would result in the need to construct or physically alter public libraries to provide adequate service levels. Accordingly, with the implementation of required mitigation, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts to public library services than previously disclosed by EIR 433.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 433 are required. Mitigation Measures D.9-1, as specified in EIR 433, has been revised to reference the currently applicable County ordinances. All measures identified in EIR 433 to mitigate impacts to library services, including Mitigation Measure D.9-1 as revised below, continue to apply to the proposed Project.

D.9-1 Prior to building permit final inspection, the project proponent shall pay mitigation fees in accordance with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 659. A portion of these fees may be utilized by the County to provide additional library facilities and staff.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in the revised Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program prepared for Addendum No. 1 to EIR 433.

40. Health Services

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.10, "Health Services;" Project Application Materials

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Findings of Fact: Impacts to health services were evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 433, which concluded that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures. The mitigation measures identified in EIR 433 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. The Project proposes a slight increase in the total number of dwelling units within SP 325, from 295 dwelling units to 343 dwelling units, which would result in a concomitant increase in the Project's demand for health services. However, the slight increase in population on the Citrus Heights property would not substantially increase impacts to health service facilities beyond what was disclosed in EIR 433, and mitigation measures specified in EIR 433 would adequately reduce Project-related impacts to health services facilities to less than significant levels. Neither approved SP 325 nor would the proposed Project result in the need to construct or physically alter health service facilities. Accordingly, with the implementation of required mitigation, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts to public health services than previously disclosed by EIR 433.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 433 are required. Mitigation Measure D.10-1, as specified in EIR 433, has been revised to reference the currently applicable County ordinances. All measures identified in EIR 433 to mitigate impacts to health services, including Mitigation Measure D.10-1 and C.5-1 as revised below, continue to apply to the proposed Project.

D.10-1 Prior to building permit final inspection, Development Mitigation Fees shall be paid as outlined in the Riverside County Development Impact Fee Program (Ordinance No. 659). The fees are used by the County fund public health facilities and operations in addition to other County services.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in the revised Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program prepared for Addendum No. 1 to EIR 433.

RECREATION

41. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.6, "Parks and Recreation;" Riverside County Ordinance No. 460; Riverside County Ordinance No. 659; RCLIS; Project Application Materials; Conditions of Approval for SP 325A1 & TR36390

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed Project would slightly modify the configuration of planned park land within SP 325 as compared to what was evaluated in EIR 433. The proposed Project would construct 7.1 acres of parks, as well as pedestrian trails, on the Citrus Heights property. No off-site parks or recreational improvements are proposed or required as part of the Project. Construction of the recreational amenities proposed by the Project on the Citrus Heights property would result in potential impacts to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, and hydrology and water quality, which have already been disclosed and evaluated within the respective issue areas of EIR 433 and this EIR Addendum. Where potentially significant impacts associated with the construction of park facilities on the Citrus Heights property are identified in EIR 433, mitigation measures are identified to reduce the impact to the maximum feasible extent. The mitigation measures identified in EIR 433 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. With the mandatory implementation of required mitigation, the proposed Project would not result in significant environmental impacts associated with the construction of recreational facilities on-site that are new or more severe than what was previously disclosed in EIR 433.

b) Impacts associated with recreational facilities were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 433, which concluded that SP 325 provided insufficient park land and would contribute to substantial physical deterioration of existing neighborhood and regional parks. EIR 433 imposed mitigation measures to reduce impacts to County of Riverside and City of Riverside recreation facilities to less than significant levels.

Implementation of the proposed Project would increase the amount of active park acreage accommodated on the Citrus Heights property, from 2.5 acres under the existing approved SP 325 to 7.1 acres under the proposed Project. Based on population generation rates included within Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, buildout of the proposed Project would generate a population of approximately 888 persons on the Citrus Heights property (343 dwelling units x 2.59 persons per dwelling units = 888 persons). Riverside County has an adopted standard of 5.0 acres of active park land for each 1,000 residents, which would result in a total demand for 4.4 acres of active park land on the Project site ([888 persons/1,000 persons] x 5.0 acres = 4.4 acres). As indicated above, the proposed Project would accommodate a total 7.1 acres of active park land on the Citrus Heights property. Because the proposed Project would provide for adequate park land to meet the needs of the Project, the proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks that could lead to or substantially contribute to their physical deterioration. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and would be reduced as compared to the level of impact disclosed in EIR 433. No mitigation would be required.

c) The Citrus Heights property is not located within a service area for a recreation and park district or a CSA responsible for providing recreational facilities. Park land dedication on the Citrus Heights property would be governed by Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, which allows for the dedication of park land in lieu of the payment of park land fees (i.e., Quimby Fees). As described above under the Response for 41.b), the Project would provide 7.1 acres of active park land on the Citrus Heights property, which would exceed the Project's obligation to provide approximately 4.5 acres of active park land on-site. Accordingly, the Project would provide adequate areas of active recreational uses on-site. A significant impact would not occur and no mitigation would be required. Impacts would be reduced as compared to that disclosed in EIR 433.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Mitigation: As described above in Response 41.b), the proposed Project would result in less than significant to park facilities and mitigation would not be required. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure D.6-1 as specified in EIR 433, which required the payment of Riverside County Developer Impact Fees, would no longer apply to the proposed Project because the Project would not result in the substantial increase in the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks that could lead to or substantially contribute to their physical deterioration (As a condition of Project approval, the Project would still be required to comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, which requires the payment of a Development Impact Fee, a portion of which is contributed toward regional parks, community centers/parks, and regional trails). In addition, Mitigation Measure D.6-2 as specified in EIR 433, which required the payment of City of Riverside park land mitigation fees, would no longer apply to the proposed Project because the Project would provide adequate park land on the Citrus Heights property and would not result in the substantial increase in the use of existing park and recreation facilities in the City of Riverside that could lead to or substantially contribute to their physical deterioration.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

42. Recreational Trails

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.6, "Parks and Recreation;" Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan Figure 8 "Trails and Bikeway System;" Project Application Materials; RCLIS

Findings of Fact:

Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan Figure 8, *Trails and Bikeway System*, depicts planned recreational trails within the Project vicinity. As shown, a regional trail is planned to traverse the eastern portion of the Citrus Heights property. The proposed Project would result in slight modifications to the planned trail system on the Citrus Heights property, but the revised trail alignment would be consistent with the planned trail designations as applied to the property by the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan. Therefore, a significant impact would not occur. This finding is consistent with the conclusions of EIR 433.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

43. Circulation

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) 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"/>
g) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.1, "Circulation and Traffic;" EIR 433, Technical Appendix K "Lake Mathews Golf and Country Club Specific Plan Traffic Impact Analysis" (Urban Crossroads, 2003; Traffic Report (Urban Crossroads, September 2012); Congestion Management Program; Ord. No. 460; Ord. No. 461; Google Earth (accessed July 16, 2012); RCLIS; Project Application Materials; Conditions of Approval for SP 325A1 & TR36390

Findings of Fact:

a) Revisions proposed as part of the proposed Project would result in the elimination of a golf course and clubhouse and an overall increase in single-family dwelling units allowed on the Citrus Heights property. Specifically, the proposed Project would allow for a maximum of 343 single-family units on the Citrus Heights property, as compared to the 295 single-family units that are allowed pursuant to the approved SP 325. Although SP 325 was approved to authorize development of 295 single-family homes, the traffic study that analyzed the approved project and that was appended to EIR 433 studied traffic generated by 300 single-family homes. Further, the traffic study prepared for the proposed Project assumes a maximum of 345 single-family homes; therefore, the comparison analysis provided in this section assumes an increase in traffic associated with 45 additional single-family homes, as addressed in EIR 433, rather than 48 additional single family homes. EIR 433 disclosed that the Project would generate an average of 3,514 traffic trips per day, including 265 AM peak hour trips and 353 PM peak hour trips. A traffic report prepared for the proposed Project by Urban Crossroads based on a maximum of 345 homes (two more homes than actually proposed) concluded that the proposed Project would generate an average of 3,302 traffic trips per day, including 259 AM peak hour trips and 348 PM peak hour trips. Therefore, traffic associated with the proposed Project would represent a reduction of 212 average daily trips, including a reduction of 6 AM peak hour trips and 4 PM peak hour trips, below what was evaluated in EIR 433.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Because traffic volumes and road improvement projects evolve over time, existing traffic conditions are not the same as they were in 2003 when the prior traffic study was prepared to support EIR 433; therefore, the traffic study prepared for the proposed Project considers existing (2012) conditions, currently anticipated future conditions, and also uses analysis techniques that are consistent with the most current County of Riverside *Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guide* (August 2008). For these reasons, the traffic study area and the Project's anticipated traffic distribution pattern are not exactly the same as disclosed in EIR 433. Nonetheless, this analysis provides an adequate basis to determine the level of traffic impact of the currently proposed Project compared to the traffic impacts that were disclosed in EIR 433. In all cases except for one intersection (Van Buren Blvd./Victoria Avenue) that was not analyzed in EIR No. 433 because a comparable intersection directly to its south (Van Buren Blvd./Dufferin Avenue) was studied instead, no new or substantially more severe traffic impacts are identified. In fact, due to the construction of several road improvement projects in the area since 2003, the LOS of many of the analyzed intersections currently operate and are projected to operate at improved LOS levels than disclosed in EIR 433. More specifically, the Project's traffic study concludes that four (4) intersections in the study area are projected to operate at a deficient level of service (LOS) and the Project's contribution of traffic at those locations is cumulatively considerable (50 or more peak hour trips). Those intersections are identified below, and a comparison is drawn provided between the information disclosed in EIR 433 and the information available in the Project's traffic report. Following the comparison discussion is a table showing the statistical information of these and other intersections in the traffic study area.

- **La Sierra Avenue / Indiana Avenue (#3)** –The proposed Project would contribute 78 AM peak hour trips and 104 PM peak hour trips to this City of Riverside intersection. This represents 2.6% and 2.2% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively, for Existing + Ambient + Project (EAP) (2016) conditions. This represents 2.3% and 1.9% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively, for Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative (2016) conditions.

EIR No. 433 disclosed that the previously approved project would contribute 79 AM peak hour trips and 106 PM peak hour trips to this intersection. As disclosed in the EIR, this represented 2.7% and 2.1% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively, for opening year conditions, and 2.0% and 1.6% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively for analysis year 2020. In comparison, and using current analysis methodology and 2012 existing conditions data, the proposed Project would contribute fewer peak hour trips to this intersection than disclosed in EIR No. 433.

- **La Sierra Avenue / Victoria Avenue (#4)** –The proposed Project would contribute 78 AM peak hour trips and 104 PM peak hour trips to this intersection, which is located partly in Riverside County and partly in the City of Riverside. This represents 3.1% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours for EAP (2016) conditions and 2.9% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours for EAPC (2016) conditions.

EIR No. 433 disclosed that the previously approved project would contribute 119 AM peak hour trips and 159 PM peak hour trips to this intersection. As disclosed in the EIR, this represented 4.7% and 5.3% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively, for opening year conditions, and 3.4% and 3.7% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively, for analysis year 2020. In comparison, and using current analysis

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

methodology and 2012 existing conditions data, the proposed Project would contribute fewer peak hour trips to this intersection than disclosed in EIR No. 433.

- **La Sierra Avenue / El Sobrante Road (#6)** – The proposed Project would contribute 36 AM peak hour trips and 49 PM peak hour trips to this intersection. This represents 3.8% and 3.6% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively, for EAP (2016) conditions and 3.6% and 3.4% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively, for EAPC (2016) conditions.

EIR No. 433 disclosed that the previously approved project would contribute 39 AM peak hour trips and 53 PM peak hour trips to this intersection. As disclosed in the EIR, this represented 3.9% and 4.2% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively, for opening year conditions, and 0.8% and 0.9% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively, for analysis year 2020. In comparison, and using current analysis methodology and 2012 existing conditions data, the proposed Project would contribute fewer peak hour trips to this intersection than that disclosed in EIR No. 433.

- **Van Buren Boulevard / Victoria Avenue (#15)** –The proposed Project would contribute 78 AM peak hour trips and 104 PM peak hour trips to this intersection. This represents 2.6% and 2.8% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively, for EAP (2016) conditions and 2.4% and 2.7% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively, for EAPC (2016) conditions.

EIR 433 did not study impacts at this intersection, so no direct comparison is possible. However, EIR 433 did study a comparable intersection at Van Buren Boulevard and Dufferin Avenue, which is the next collector road intersection to the south. Traffic volumes at either intersection are projected to be similar, so the analysis is comparable. EIR 433 disclosed that the previously approved project would contribute 52 AM peak hour trips and 71 PM peak hour trips to the Van Buren Blvd./Dufferin Avenue intersection. As disclosed in the EIR, this represented 1.4% and 1.9% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively for opening year conditions, and 1.3% and 1.8% of the total projected traffic during the peak hours, respectively for analysis year 2020. In comparison (and in recognition that it is not a direct comparison because different intersections were studied), and using current analysis methodology and 2012 existing conditions data, the proposed Project would contribute more peak hour trips to this intersection than that disclosed in EIR No. 433.

In conclusion, EIR 433 disclosed that all intersections significantly impacted by the approved project could operate at acceptable levels of service with identified improvements and mitigation, with the exception of the intersection of La Sierra Avenue/Cleveland Avenue. Although that intersection was not studied in the Project's traffic analysis, the Project contributes less peak hour traffic on La Sierra Avenue than disclosed in EIR 433; thus, the Project's contribution to LOS deficiency at that intersection would be less severe than disclosed in EIR 433. Further, mitigation measures identified in EIR 433 would continue to apply to the proposed Project with some modification to ensure that all Project-related impacts to the four (4) intersections identified above are reduced to less than significant levels. And, the construction of Street "A" between McAllister Street and Van Buren Boulevard in association with the Project will improve traffic operations in the local vicinity.

Potentially Significant New Impact Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant New Impact Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433

Table 5 Summary of Intersection Analysis by Scenario

#	Intersection	Traffic Control ²	Intersection Approach Lanes ¹												Delay ² (secs.)		Level of Service	
			Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound			AM	PM	AM	PM
			L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R				
1	La Sierra Avenue / SR-91 WB Ramps																	
	- Existing (2012)	TS	2	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	19.4	20.8	B	C
	- Existing + Project	TS	2	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	19.8	21.0	B	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016) ⁴	TS	2	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	21.3	24.7	C	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative ⁴	TS	2	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	23.3	30.9	C	C
2	La Sierra Avenue / SR-91 EB Ramps																	
	- Existing (2012)	TS	0	2	1	2	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	20.4	24.8	C	C
	- Existing + Project	TS	0	2	1	2	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	20.8	25.3	C	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	TS	0	2	1	2	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	21.5	27.2	C	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	TS	0	2	1	2	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	23.2	34.8	C	C
3	La Sierra Avenue / Indiana Avenue																	
	- Existing (2012)	TS	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	1	2	2	d	42.8	47.6	D	D
	- Existing + Project	TS	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	1	2	2	d	43.1	49.3	D	D
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	TS	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	1	2	2	d	35.4	40.3	D	D
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	TS	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	1	2	2	1>	38.7	52.2	D	D
4	La Sierra Avenue / Victoria Avenue																	
	- Existing (2012)	TS	1	2	d	1	2	d	2	1	1	1	1	1	34.1	46.4	C	D
	- Existing + Project	TS	1	2	d	1	2	d	2	1	1	1	1	1	34.7	50.9	C	D
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	TS	1	2	d	1	2	d	2	1	1	2	1	1	34.9	48.6	C	D
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative ⁵	TS	1	2	d	1	2	d	2	1	1	2	1	1	39.9	61.3	D	E
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	TS	1	2	d	1	3	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	40.0	38.0	D	D
5	La Sierra Avenue / McAllister Parkway																	
	- Existing (2012)	TS	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	21.4	22.0	C	C
	- Existing + Project	TS	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	27.6	22.5	C	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	TS	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	30.7	23.5	C	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	TS	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	43.4	25.0	D	C
6	La Sierra Avenue / El Sobrante Road																	
	- Existing (2012)	AWS	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	12.5	48.6	B	F ⁶
	- Existing + Project	AWS	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	13.5	>50.0	B	F
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	TS	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	24.0	31.3	C	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	TS	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	24.5	32.3	C	C
7	McAllister Street / Fairway Drive																	
	- Existing (2012)																	
	- Existing + Project	CSS	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10.4	10.1	B	B
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	CSS	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10.5	10.1	B	B
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	CSS	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10.7	10.3	B	B
8	McAllister Street / El Sobrante Road																	
	- Existing (2012)	CSS	0	0	0	1	0	d	1	1	0	0	2	0	13.0	16.9	B	C
	- Existing + Project	CSS	0	0	0	1	0	d	1	1	0	0	2	0	13.9	19.3	B	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	CSS	0	0	0	1	0	d	1	1	0	0	2	0	14.5	21.1	B	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	CSS	0	0	0	1	0	d	1	1	0	0	2	0	15.2	23.6	C	C
9	Driveway 1 / Fairway Drive																	
	- Existing (2012)																	
	- Existing + Project	CSS	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	9.3	9.8	A	A
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	CSS	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	9.3	9.8	A	A
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	CSS	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	9.4	9.9	A	A

Potentially Significant New Impact
 Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant New Impact
 Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433

Table 5 (con't) Summary of Intersection Analysis by Scenario

#	Intersection	Traffic Control ³	Intersection Approach Lanes ¹												Delay ² (secs.)		Level of Service	
			Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound			AM	PM	AM	PM
			L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R				
10	Driveway 2 / Fairway Drive		Future Intersection Location															
	- Existing (2012)																	
	- Existing + Project	CSS	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	9.0	9.2	A	A
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	CSS	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	9.0	9.2	A	A
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	CSS	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	9.1	9.3	A	A
11	SR-91 EB Ramps / Indiana Avenue																	
	- Existing (2012)	TS	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	1>	31.4	33.4	C	C
	- Existing + Project	TS	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	1>	31.4	33.4	C	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	TS	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	1>	31.6	35.0	C	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	TS	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	1>	33.9	36.5	C	D
12	Van Buren Boulevard / SR-91 WB Ramps																	
	- Existing (2012)	TS	2	3	0	0	+	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	23.5	22.6	C	C
	- Existing + Project	TS	2	3	0	0	+	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	23.5	23.1	C	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	TS	2	3	0	0	+	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	24.7	25.7	C	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	TS	2	3	0	0	+	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	27.3	28.4	C	C
13	Van Buren Boulevard / SR-91 EB On-Ramp																	
	- Existing (2012)	UC	0	5	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	A	A
	- Existing + Project	UC	0	5	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	A	A
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	UC	0	5	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	A	A
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	UC	0	5	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	A	A
14	Van Buren Boulevard / Indiana Avenue																	
	- Existing (2012)	TS	1	3	0	1	3	1>	2	1	2>	1	2	0	29.6	29.7	C	C
	- Existing + Project	TS	1	3	0	1	3	1>	2	1	2>	1	2	0	30.1	29.2	C	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	TS	1	3	0	1	3	1>	2	1	2>	1	2	0	32.9	31.6	C	C
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	TS	1	3	0	1	3	1>	2	1	2>	1	2	0	36.9	37.4	D	D
15	Van Buren Boulevard / Victoria Avenue																	
	- Existing (2012)	TS	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1>	1	1	1	36.5	48.8	D	D
	- Existing + Project	TS	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1>	1	1	1	37.4	53.0	D	D
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	TS	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1>	1	1	1	40.2	37.4	D	D
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	TS	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1>	1	1	1	46.7	40.3	D	D
16	Van Buren Boulevard / Fairway Drive																	
	- Existing (2012)		Future Intersection Location															
	- Existing + Project	TS	1	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	18.6	15.6	B	B
	- Existing + Ambient + Project (2016)	TS	1	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	20.1	19.1	C	B
	- Existing + Ambient + Project + Cumulative	TS	1	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	26.6	22.0	C	C

¹ When a right turn is designated, the lane can either be striped or unstriped. To function as a right turn lane there must be sufficient width for right turning vehicles to travel outside the through lanes.

L = Left; T = Through; R = Right; > = Right-Turn Overlap Phasing; d = Defacto Right Turn Lane

² Per the 2003 Highway Capacity Manual, overall average intersection delay and level of service are shown for intersections with a traffic signal or all way stop control. For intersections with cross street stop control, the delay and level of service for the worst individual movement (or movements sharing a single lane) are shown. The SR-91 ramp locations at La Sierra Avenue and Van Buren Boulevard have been analyzed using the Synchro software. Exceptions to this include the SR-91 EB On-Ramp at Van Buren Boulevard which has been analyzed using Traffic, and the intersection of Van Buren Boulevard at Indiana Avenue which was analyzed using Synchro.

³ TS = Traffic Signal; AWS = All-Way Stop; CSS = Cross-street Stop; UC = Uncontrolled

⁴ It should be noted that the intersection would be improved to its ultimate General Plan designation with the recommended right turn lane. As such, it is recommended that the westbound (north leg) crosswalk be removed to provide additional green time to the other movements and reduce delays to acceptable levels.

⁵ Feasible improvement recommendation due to existing right-of-way constraints. In addition to a 2nd westbound left turn lane, the recommendation at this intersection includes the removal of the eastbound (south leg) crosswalk.

⁶ Volume-to-capacity ratio is greater than 1.00; Intersection unstable; Level of Service 'F'

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2012

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in a significant new or more severe traffic impact due to a conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Additional mitigation measures beyond those already specified in EIR 433 would not be required.

b) The only CMP-designated roadways in the Project vicinity are Van Buren Boulevard, SR-91, and I-15. The CMP roadway system has been designed to adequately convey traffic volumes generated by ultimate buildout of the land uses identified by the County's General Plan land use map. Existing Specific Plan No. 325 is consistent with the County General Plan land use map, and provides for the ultimate build-out of residential, recreational, and open space land uses. The proposed Project seeks to eliminate a golf course and club house from the SP 325, while slightly increasing residential density within the SP 325 area. Although the proposed Project would result in a slight increase in the number of residential units permitted on the Citrus Heights property, as described above under Response 43.a), traffic volumes generated by the Project would not exceed the traffic volumes associated with SP 325. Therefore, the Project's long-term impacts related to established levels of service for CMP designated roads or highways would be less than significant. The proposed Project would be consistent with the traffic projections within the applicable congestion management plan, and would not result in new impacts that were not previously identified in EIR 433.

c & d) The proposed Project site is not located within an airport influence area and is not located adjacent to a rail corridor or waterway. Therefore, the Project would neither increase air, rail or waterborne traffic levels, nor result in substantial safety risks associated with these modes of travel. No impact would occur.

e) The proposed Project would be conditioned to construct all onsite roadway segments and frontage improvements in accordance with Riverside County road improvement standards and specifications. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not create any sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or other transportation hazards. The land uses proposed on the Citrus Heights property (single-family residential, recreational, and open space), would be compatible with the surrounding area; therefore, the proposed Project would not create or substantially increase a transportation hazard due to incompatible uses. Street "A" is designed to County standards and specifications and also would not create a transportation design hazard. No impact would occur.

f) Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the establishment of public roads (Street "A" and internal streets on the Citrus Heights property), which would require maintenance. Public roads require periodic maintenance; however, such maintenance is inherent in operational activities and would not cause any new or more severe physical impacts to the environment beyond those disclosed in EIR 433.

g) The proposed Project is not anticipated to affect any roadways in the vicinity of the site during construction, as it is anticipated that surrounding roadways have sufficient capacity to accommodate construction vehicle traffic traveling to and from the site. The proposed Project would have similar construction characteristics as analyzed by EIR 433. As such, it is concluded that the proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse effect upon circulation during construction, and a significant impact would not occur.

h) The proposed Project would be required to comply with Riverside County Ordinance Nos. 460 & 461, which regulate access road provisions. The requirement to provide adequate paved access to the Citrus Heights property would be required as a condition of Project approval. Additionally, the

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

proposed Project would not affect any roadways that provide emergency access under existing conditions. With required adherence to County requirements for emergency access, impacts would be less than significant.

i) The proposed Project would accommodate a regional trail and community trails on the Citrus Heights property. The Citrus Heights property is not currently served by the Regional Transportation Agency (RTA); therefore, the Project is not required to provide transit support facilities. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not result in conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation, and a significant impact would not occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 433 are required. Mitigation Measures D.1-1, D.1-2, and D.1-3, as specified in EIR 433, have been revised to reference the currently applicable County/City ordinances and to comply with the requirements of CEQA and California law. All measures identified in EIR 433 to mitigate impacts to transportation/traffic, including Mitigation Measures D.1-1, D.1-2, and D.1-3 as revised below, continue to apply to the proposed Project.

D.1-1 Prior to approval of final building permits, the applicant shall pay County of Riverside Traffic Signal Mitigation Program fees to off-set the project's short-term impacts to intersections in the County (pursuant to County Ordinance No. 748).

D.1-2 Prior to approval of final building permits, the applicant shall use all reasonable efforts to enter into an agreement with the City of Riverside to pay standard fair-share traffic impact fees for its contribution of traffic to the La Sierra Avenue / Indiana Avenue intersection, La Sierra Avenue / Victoria Avenue intersection, and Van Buren Boulevard / Victoria Avenue intersection.

D.1-3 Prior to approval of final building permits, the applicant shall participate in funding of off-site improvements through payment of the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 433.

44. Bike Trails

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.6, "Parks and Recreation;" Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan Figure 8 "Trails and Bikeway System;" Project Application Materials; RCLIS

Findings of Fact:

As shown on Figure 8, *Trails and Bikeways System*, of the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan, there are no bike trails located in the vicinity of the Project site. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not create an inconsistency or conflict with the planned bike trail alignment for the area and a significant impact would not occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

45. Water

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

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.2, "Water and Sewer Services;" 2010 WMWD UWMP; California Building Standards Code; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) As discussed in EIR 433, the subject property is located within the domestic water service area of the Western Municipal Water District (WMWD). Potential impacts associated with supplying water to a master-planned residential community, including the construction of water conveyance infrastructure, were evaluated as part of EIR 433, which concluded that impacts would be less than significant. The proposed Project would modify approved SP 325 to eliminate the golf course and golf course clubhouse and increase the total amount of dwelling units allowed on the Citrus Heights property by 48, to a total of 343. Assuming potable water demand generation rates equal to those that were used in EIR 433, which assumed a daily potable water demand of 1,140 gallons per day per residential unit, the proposed Project would generate a daily potable water demand of approximately 391,020 gallons (343 residential units x 1,140 gallons per day = 391,020). This would correspond to an increase in demand under the Project of approximately 52,220 gallons of potable water per day, or approximately 15.4 percent, above what was disclosed in EIR 433. Implementation of the Project would eliminate the demand for 800,000 to 1,200,000 gallons per day of non-potable water.

Although the Project would result in a modest increase in potable water demands on the Citrus Heights property, the proposed Project would be required to comply with the most recent version of the California Building Standards Code that went into effect on January 1, 2011, and requires much more stringent water conservation practices than evaluated by EIR 433. Specifically, the California Building Standards Code requires a 20-percent reduction in indoor water use (which is not reflected in the potable water demand projections in the paragraph above), as compared standard baselines for plumbing fixtures and fittings. The water conservation requirements of the California Building Standards Code are anticipated to off-set the Project's increase in potable water demand above levels disclosed in EIR 433. As such, the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in the demand for potable water above the levels disclosed in EIR 433. Further, in their 2010 UWMP, WMWD projects to have a surplus in available water supplies to meet water demands over the next 25 years in all climatic conditions, including normal year, single-dry year, and multiple-dry years. The Project's slight increase in potable water demand, as compared to approved SP 325, would only represent a very small fraction of one percent of WMWD's projected potable water surplus over the next 25 years in all climatic conditions. As such, sufficient water supplies from existing entitlements or resources are anticipated to be available to serve the Project, and new or expanded

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

entitlements would not be needed. As such, impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required. The Project would not result in new or more severe significant impacts to water utilities above what was previously disclosed in EIR 433.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

46. Sewer

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

b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.2, "Water and Sewer Services;" California Building Standards Code; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) As discussed in EIR 433, the subject property is located within the wastewater service area of the Western Municipal Water District (WMWD). Potential impacts associated with supplying wastewater services to a master-planned residential community, including the construction of water conveyance infrastructure, were evaluated as part of EIR 433, which concluded that impacts would be less than significant. The proposed Project would modify approved SP 325 to eliminate the golf course and golf course clubhouse and increase the total amount of dwelling units allowed on the subject property by 48, to a total of 343. Assuming wastewater demand generation rates equal to those that were used in EIR 433, which assumed a daily wastewater demand of 330 gallons per day per residential unit, the proposed Project would generate a wastewater demand of approximately 113,190 gallons (343 residential units x 330 gallons per day = 113,190). This would correspond to an increase in demand of approximately 13,670 gallons per day, or approximately 13.7 percent, above what was disclosed in EIR 433.

Although the Project would result in a modest increase in the demand for wastewater services on the Citrus Heights property, the proposed Project would be required to comply with the most recent version of the California Building Standards Code that went into effect on January 1, 2011, and requires much more stringent water conservation practices than evaluated by EIR 433. Specifically, the California Building Standards Code requires a 20-percent reduction in indoor water use (which is not reflected in the potable water demand projections in the paragraph above), as compared standard baselines for plumbing fixtures and fittings. The water conservation requirements of the California Building Standards Code are anticipated to off-set the increase in waste water demand above the levels disclosed in EIR 433. As such, the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in a substantial

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

increase in the demand for wastewater services above what was previously disclosed in EIR 433. Further, wastewater flows from the Project site would be conveyed to the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority (WRCRWA) wastewater treatment facility. The WRCRWA facility has a present treatment capacity of 8,000,000 gallons per day with an ultimate expansion potential to 32,000,000 gallons per day. The Project's slight increase in demand for wastewater services represents a fraction of one percent of the existing treatment capacity of the WRCRWA facility, and would not cause the exceedance of available treatment resources or the construction of new or expanded facilities. Accordingly, sufficient wastewater treatment facilities are anticipated to be available to serve the Project, and new or expanded facilities would not be needed. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required. The Project would not result in new or more severe significant impacts to waste water utilities above what was previously disclosed in EIR 433.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

47. 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) Does the project 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: EIR 433, Section V.D.8, "Solid Waste;" Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) Impacts to solid waste services and landfill capacity were evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 433, which concluded that such impacts would be less than significant. Conditions of approval were applied to SP 325 to ensure that development of the Citrus Heights property and long-term operation would comply with applicable solid waste statutes and regulations. The proposed Project would modify approved SP 325 to eliminate the golf course and golf course clubhouse and increase the total amount of dwelling units allowed on the subject property by 48, to a total of 343. Using the solid waste generation rates provided in EIR 433 (i.e., 1.42 tons per residential unit per year), the proposed Project would generate approximately 487.1 tons of solid waste per year (343 residential units x 1.42 tons per year = 487.1 tons), which is substantially less than the 528.4 tons per year that was disclosed in EIR 433. In addition, the proposed Project would be conditioned similarly to SP 325 to require compliance with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would result in reduced impacts to solid waste services as compared to EIR 433. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

48. Utilities

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

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

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.11, "Energy Resources;" EIR 433, Section V.D.7, "Utilities;" California Building Standards Code; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) through g) Impacts to utilities were evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 433, which concluded that physical impacts associated with the provision of utility services to the Project site would occur within the ground disturbance area analyzed by EIR 433 (including off-site utility improvements that would be constructed within the existing public rights-of-ways of developed/paved streets). No other physical impacts would have the potential to occur. Although the proposed Project would modify the proposed utility plan, as compared to what was evaluated in EIR 433, the proposed Project would not create any new or more severe significant impacts related to the installation and use of utilities. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required, which is similar to the conclusion of EIR 433.

The proposed Project would modify approved SP 325 to eliminate the golf course and golf course clubhouse and increase the total number of single-family dwelling units allowed on the Citrus Heights property by 48, to a total of 343. Utilizing electricity and natural gas demand rates provided in EIR 433, the proposed Project would result in a slight increase in the demand for energy resources above what was disclosed in EIR 433. However, the proposed Project would be required to comply with the most recent version of the California Building Standards Code that went into effect on January 1, 2011 and requires much more stringent energy efficiency practices than evaluated by EIR 433. Specifically, the California Building Standards Code requires the use of energy efficient appliances and building materials, lower water usage, and landfill waste diversion/recycling, which directly and indirectly reduce energy demands during operation. Mandatory compliance with the California Building Standards Code is anticipated to off-set most, if not all, of the increase in the Project's increase in energy demand as compared to energy levels disclosed in EIR 433. Accordingly, the proposed Project is anticipated to result in a slight increase to energy demands, which energy purveyors are anticipated to be able to accommodate through long-range planning efforts. Implementation of the Project is not anticipated to result in any new or more severe significant impacts to utilities beyond the levels previously disclosed by EIR 433.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

49. Energy Conservation

a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?

Source: EIR 433, Section V.D.11, "Energy Resources;" EIR 433, Section V.D.7, "Utilities;" California Building Standards Code; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

The proposed Project would not conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans. As discussed above under Responses 48.a) & b), the proposed Project is anticipated to result in a slight increase in energy demand compared to what was disclosed in EIR 433; however, the proposed Project would be required to comply with the most recent version of the California Building Standards Code, which required much more stringent energy efficiency practices (the use of energy efficient appliances and building materials, lower water usage, and landfill waste diversion/recycling, etc.) than evaluated by EIR 433. Mandatory compliance with the California Building Standards Code is anticipated to offset most, if not all, of the Project's increase in energy demand as compared to levels disclosed in EIR 433. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not create a substantial conflict with adopted energy conservation plans, and impacts would be less than significant. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of EIR 433.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

OTHER

50. Other:

Source: Staff review

Findings of Fact:

There are no other impacts identified.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project and no mitigation measures were required by EIR 433.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: Implementation of the proposed Project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

52. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects and probable future projects)?

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The proposed Project does not create any additional impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable, beyond those disclosed in EIR 433.

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

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

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

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
---	--	--	--

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any: Final EIR No. 433 (SCH No. 2001061096)

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

Location: County of Riverside Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
Riverside, CA 92505

VII. AUTHORITIES CITED

Authorities cited: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21083.05; References: California Government Code Section 65088.4; Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095 and 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

VIII. REFERENCES

The following documents were referred to as information sources during the preparation of this document.

Cited As:

1996 SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan	<i>1996 Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide.</i> Southern California Association of Governments. 1996.
1997 SCAQMD AQMP	<i>1997 Air Quality Management Plan.</i> South Coast Air Quality Management District. November 15, 1996.
2010 WMWD UWMP	<i>Final 2010 Urban Water Management Plan Update.</i> Western Municipal Water District. June 2011.
Air Quality Report	<i>Citrus Heights Air Quality Impact Analysis.</i> Urban Crossroads, February 6, 2013.
Airport Master Records and Reports Database	Airport IQ 5010, Airport Master Records and Reports. GCR, Inc. & Federal Aviation Administration. http://www.gcr1.com/5010WEB/
Biological Opinion	Formal Consultation, Lake Mathews Golf and Country Club, Riverside County, California (1-6-06-F-204.1). United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. May 16, 2006.
Biology Report	<i>Biological Technical Report for the Citrus Heights Project and Riverside County Capital Project No. C1-0641.</i> Glenn Lukos Associates. December 17, 2012
Blasting Analysis	<i>Lake Mathews Project – Tract 36390: Assessment of Rock Blasting Impacts and Recommended Practices.</i> REVEY Associates. February 17, 2013.
California Building Standards Code	California Code of Regulations, Title 24, "California Building Standards Code" as in effect as of January 1, 2011.
Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit	Department of the Army Permit (File # SPL-2005-1112-SJH). Department of the Army, Los Angeles District, Corps of Engineers. February 20, 2007.
Conditions of Approval for SP 325A1 & TR36390	Conditions of Approval for SP 325A1 & TR36390, as on file with the Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency
Congestion Management Program	<i>2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program.</i> Riverside County Transportation Commission. December 14, 2011.
Cooperative	Agreement by and Between Riverside County and City of Riverside for "A"

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Agreement	Street (Fairway Drive) Improvements. Riverside County Transportation Contract No. 12-03-003. April 18, 2012.
City General Plan	<i>City of Riverside General Plan 2025</i> . City of Riverside Community Development Department, November 2007.
City General Plan EIR	<i>Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the City of Riverside General Plan</i> . City of Riverside Planning Division, Community Development Department. Certified November 2007 (SCH No. 2004021108).
County General Plan	<i>County of Riverside General Plan</i> . Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency, October 2003.
County General Plan EIR	<i>General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report</i> . County of Riverside Transportation and Land Management Agency, Planning Department. Certified October 7, 2003 (SCH No. 2002051143).
CREED v. City of San Diego	<i>Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development v. City of San Diego</i> , 196 Cal. App. 4 th 515 (2011).
Cultural Study	<i>A Phase I and Phase II Cultural Resource Study for the Citrus Heights/Fairway Drive Project</i> . Brian F. Smith and Associates, July 23, 2013.
DBESP Addendum	<i>Addendum to Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation for the Citrus Heights Project (formerly Lake Mathews Golf and Country Club)</i> . Glenn Lukos Associates, June 10, 2013.
EI Sobrante Policy Area Consistency Memorandum	<i>Citrus Heights Specific Plan Amendment (SP325A1) – Relationship to LMWAP 1.1</i> . T&B Planning, Inc., July 22, 2013.
EnviroStor Database	EnviroStor Database. California Department of Toxic Substances Control. http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public
Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program	"Riverside County Important Farmland 2010." California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, January 2012.
Final EIR No. 433 and Final EIR No. 433 Technical Appendices	<i>Final Environmental Impact Report No. 433 (SCH No. 2001061096) for Lake Mathews Golf and Country Club, Specific Plan No. 325</i> . Certified 2004.
FEMA Map Viewer	FEMA Mapping Information Platform. Federal Emergency Management Agency. https://hazards.fema.gov/wps/portal/mapviewer

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Findings and Statement of Facts, Statement of Overriding Considerations for EIR No. 433
 Contained within Riverside County Resolution No. 2004-539 Certifying Environmental Impact Report No. 433 and Adopting Specific Plan No. 325 (Lake Mathews Golf & County Club). Adopted December 21, 2004.

Fire Protection Plan
Citrus Heights Fire Behavior and Fire Protection Plan Report. Firesafe Planning Solutions, May 23, 2013.

Google Earth
 Google Earth (ver. 6.1.0.5001)

Greenhouse Gas Report
Citrus Heights Greenhouse Gas Analysis. Urban Crossroads, February 6, 2013.

Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan
Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan. Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency, October 2003.

Ord. No. 460
 Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, Subdivision Regulations.

Ord. No. 461
 Riverside County Ordinance No. 461, Road Improvement Standards & Specifications

Ord. No. 484
 Riverside County Ordinance No. 484, Sand Blowing.

Ord. No. 625
 Riverside County Ordinance No. 625, Agricultural Activities for Nuisance Defenses.

Ord. No. 655
 Riverside County Ordinance No. 655, Regulating Light Pollution.

Ord. No. 659
 Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, Establishing a Development Impact Fee Program.

Pechanga Letter
 Letter to Christian Hinojosa of Riverside County from Tuba Ebru Ozdil of Pechanga Cultural Resources, dated August 1, 2012.

Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation
Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Lake Mathews Project, Tract 36390, County of Riverside, California. Alta California Geotechnical, October 3, 2012.

Preliminary Hydrology Report
Tentative Tract 36390 Preliminary Hydrology Report. MDS Consulting, May 21, 2012.

Preliminary Paleontological Resource Impact Assessment
Preliminary Paleontological Resource Impact Assessment for the Lake Mathews 330 Project Site, Riverside County, California. Brian F. Smith and Associates, March 6, 2012.

Preliminary Water
Preliminary Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan for Tract

Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 433
------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Quality Management Plan	35390, located within the County of Riverside, CA. MDS Consulting, May 15, 2012.
Project Application Materials	SP00325A1, CZ07779, and TR36390, as on file with the Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency
RCLIS	Riverside County Land Information System. Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency. http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rclis/index.html
Resolution No. 2004-539	Riverside County Resolution No. 2004-539 Certifying Environmental Impact Report No. 433 and Adopting Specific Plan No. 325 (Lake Mathews Golf & County Club). Adopted December 21, 2004.
SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)	<i>Final 2007 Air Quality Management Plan.</i> South Coast Air Quality Management District, June 2007.
SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook	<i>CEQA Air Quality Handbook.</i> South Coast Air Quality Management District. April 1993, with November 1993 Update.
SCAQMD Rule 1113	South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113, Architectural Coatings, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
Streambed Alteration Agreement	Agreement Regarding Proposed Stream or Lake Alternation, Notification No. 1600-2005-0076-R6 (Revision 2). State of California, Department of Fish and Game. June 21, 2006.
Traffic Report	<i>Citrus Heights Traffic Impact Analysis.</i> Urban Crossroads, September 2012.
Western Riverside County Growth Forecasts 2010-2035	<i>Western Riverside County Growth Forecasts 2010-2035.</i> Western Riverside Council of Governments. www.wrcog.cog.ca.us/downloads/Revised%20WRCOG20GF%20From%20SCAG%20092211.pdf
WRC-MSHCP	<i>Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.</i> Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency, October 2003.

Revised: 8/20/2013 6:30 PM
EA 2010.docx

III. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

SP00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

III. Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
<p>SECTION V.C.1 – SEISMIC SAFETY</p> <p>Differential settlement could occur where the transitions between cut and fill material occur. Localized groundwater seeps may be encountered in areas where excavation occurs in dense bedrock. Project soils are suitable for the construction of the proposed slopes. Implementation of the recommendations made by the geotechnical report would reduce any potential impacts to below a level of significance, and these recommendations are provided as standard conditions of approval.</p>	<p>Determined to be not significant.</p>	<p>Impacts would not be significant, thus, no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>SECTION V.C.2 – SOILS, SLOPE AND EROSION</p> <p>Although two on-site soil associations and two additional off-site soil associations are subject to high erosion potential, the project's natural slopes are generally stable. Some erosion can be expected during grading operations, however, this potential can be minimized to acceptable levels with implementation of the standard conditions of project approval.</p>	<p>Determined to be not significant.</p>	<p>Impacts would not be significant, thus, no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>SECTION V.C.3 – HYDROLOGY, FLOODING AND DRAINAGE</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed project would alter the existing drainage patterns through the development of residential and recreational uses.</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed drainage plan would slightly reduce stormwater flows leaving the site, thereby avoiding erosion and flooding impacts downstream. The residential portions of the project would not be subject to inundation from the Harrison Dam. Adequate capacity</p>	<p>Determined to be not significant.</p>	<p>Impacts would not be significant, thus, no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

SP00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
<p>exists within the Harrison Dam to store the project's additional Stormwater flows without affecting the current storage limit area. Thus, no significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>However, standard conditions of approval would be required of the project to insure that the project's drainage facilities would be in conformance with the County's standard requirements.</p>				
<p>SECTION V.C.4 - NOISE</p>				
<p>The proposed project would generate traffic and, as a result, would increase vehicular noise levels in the surrounding areas. Exterior noise levels in residential areas proposed within .55 feet of the McAllister Street centerline (near Street "B") would exceed the County's 65 dB CNEL standard. Consequently, a significant exterior noise impact would occur in Planning Area 1.</p> <p>Short-term construction noise could potentially exceed ambient noise levels. Thus, a significant, short-term noise impact would occur.</p>	<p>Below a level of significance.</p>	<p>C.4-1 If the project proponent proposes rock blasting within 250 feet of any existing residence, the applicant shall notify the occupant(s)/Owner(s) within 48 hours of the scheduled blasting time.</p> <p>C.4-2 If useable outdoor spaces (i.e., rear yards), within Planning Area 1 are constructed within 55 feet of the centerline of McAllister Street (near Street "B"), a 5-foot noise abatement wall shall be constructed on the perimeter of those outdoor spaces abutting McAllister Street.</p> <p>C.4-3 Those homes requiring exterior noise protection in Planning Area 1 shall be provided with closeable windows. Each unit requiring such protection shall be provided with a means of supplemental ventilation to meet UBC/CBC requirements (two air changes per hour with at least 20 percent fresh "make-up" air). Central air conditioning as a standard feature would allow the interior standard to be met at all project residences.</p>	<p>Riverside County, Building and Safety Department</p> <p>Riverside County, Building and Safety Department</p> <p>Riverside County, Building and Safety Department</p>	<p>Concurrent with grading and building permits.</p> <p>Prior to tentative tract map approval.</p> <p>Prior to tentative tract map approval.</p>
<p>SECTION V.C.5 - AIR QUALITY</p>				
<p>Temporary construction-related air emissions would occur during project development, including dust, equipment, exhaust, and architectural surface treatments fumes.</p> <p>In the long-term, the proposed project's vehicular-related emissions</p>	<p>Temporary short-term construction impacts for PM10 (dust), Nox (vehicle exhaust) and VOC (architectural coatings) cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.</p> <p>The project's cumulative impact of CO (mobile source emissions)</p>	<p>C.5-1 Prior to final map recordation, the County shall verify the following notes are listed on the Environmental Constraint Sheet. The County also shall verify that the following notes are listed on the grading plan prior to grading permit issuance:</p> <p>"During grading and ground-disturbing construction activities, the construction contractor shall assure that water trucks or sprinkler systems apply water to</p>	<p>Project Applicant/Riverside County, Building and Safety Department</p>	<p>Prior to the recordation of final map(s) and issuance of grading permits.</p>

SP00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
<p>would contribute to the regional inability to attain the ozone standard based on SCAQMD's recommended significance levels.</p>	<p>cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>unpaved roads and areas undergoing active ground disturbance within the Project site a minimum of three (3) times daily. At a minimum, watering shall occur in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work has been completed for the day.”</p> <p>“If wind speed is 15 mph or greater, water shall be sprayed onto areas subject to blasting to wet the ground surface before blasting.”</p> <p>“The construction contractor shall assure that temporary signs indicating a maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour (MPH) are placed along all unpaved roads and/or unpaved haul routes on the Project site, before construction activities commence. The construction contractor shall be responsible for assuring the enforcement of the 15 MPH speed limit throughout the duration of construction activities.”</p> <p>C.5-2 Prior to final map recordation, the County shall verify the following note is listed on the Environmental Constraints Sheet. The County also shall verify that the following note is listed on the grading and construction plans prior to the issuance of grading and building permits:</p> <p>“The construction contractor shall assure that temporary signs indicating that all construction equipment on-site shall not idle for more than five (5) minutes are placed at all loading, unloading, and equipment staging areas, before construction activities commence. The construction contractor shall be responsible for assuring enforcement of the five (5) minute idling limit throughout the duration of construction activities.”</p> <p>C.5-3 The project's applicant/contractor shall: 1) encourage car pooling for construction workers; 2) limit lane closures to off-peak travel periods; 3) prohibit parking of construction vehicles on the surrounding traveled roadways; 4) wet down or cover dirt hauled off-site; 5) wash or sweep access points daily; 6) encourage receipt of materials during non-peak traffic hours' and 7) sandbag construction sites for erosion control.</p>	<p>Project Applicant/Riverside County, Building and Safety Department</p> <p>Riverside County, Building and Safety Department</p>	<p>Prior to the recordation of final map(s) and issuance of grading and building permits.</p> <p>Concurrent with construction activities.</p>

SP00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
<p>SECTION V.C.6 – WATER QUALITY</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed project would include grading operations that would result in potential short-term erosion and sedimentation impacts. Project grading would result in the creation of temporarily exposed ground surfaces, thereby creating the potential for erosion and sedimentation of local drainage courses.</p> <p>Implementation of the project would also alter the composition of the surface runoff by grading the site surfaces, constructing impervious streets, roofs, and parking facilities; and irrigating landscaped areas. This runoff, typical of urban use, would contribute to the incremental degradation of the water quality downstream.</p> <p>Additionally, the use of fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides associated with the proposed golf course would have the potential to adversely impact surface water quality.</p>	<p>Below a level of significance.</p>	<p>C.6-1 Pursuant to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board, the project applicant shall obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction permit, prior to issuance of grading permits. The NPDES permit would apply to all construction activities associated with the proposed project, including clearing, grading, or excavation that results in the disturbance of at least five acres of total land area, or activity which is part of a larger common plan of development of five acres or greater. Therefore, as mitigation for the Specific Plan, the developer or builder shall comply with the appropriate NPDES construction permit prior to commencing grading activities. All development within the Specific Plan boundaries shall be subject to future requirements adopted by the County to implement the NPDES program.</p> <p>C.6-2 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall obtain a NPDES permit for residential development. The NPDES permit would require the applicant to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that incorporates the current Best Management Practices and Best Available Technologies (BMPs and BATs) for pollution and erosion/siltation control on the residential portions of the site. Examples of BMPs and BATs include, but are not limited to: energy dissipation structures and rip-rap at stormwater discharge points to stabilize flow and reduce velocities; placement of mulching on cleared or freshly seeded areas for erosion/sedimentation control; geotextiles and mats for erosion control during minor construction/improvement activities, storm drain inlet/outlet protection for siltation control; slope drains for erosion control; the use of low-water requirement vegetation in landscaping, selection of slope planting species with low fertilization requirements; and requiring permanent irrigation systems to be inspected on a regular basis and properly maintained.</p> <p>C.6-3 The project shall comply with the requirements of</p>	<p>Riverside County Building and Safety and the California State Water Quality Control Board</p> <p>Project Applicant, Riverside County Department of Building and Safety and California State Water Quality Control Board</p>	<p>Prior to commencing grading activities.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of grading permits.</p> <p>Prior to commencing</p>

SF00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
<p>SECTION V.C.7 – TOXIC SUBSTANCES</p>				
<p>The project proposes residential and recreational uses on the subject site. It is not anticipated that the project would generate any toxic waste. However, building and construction of the project site would include household waste, such as paints, roofing materials, and solvents.</p> <p>Numerous empty 55-gallon drums were observed in the northwestern area of the site. Also, oil staining was observed on a dirt road in the northwestern portion of the site, adjacent to the drums. In several areas on-site, there was evidence of common household trash having been dumped.</p> <p>Although, there is a remote potential for exposure to toxic substances during construction activities and the proposed golf course would potentially store, handle, or generate toxic substances on-site, potential impacts associated with exposure would be minimized to acceptable levels with implementation of conditions of project approval.</p>	<p>Determined to be not significant.</p>	<p>Impacts would not be significant, thus, no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>SECTION V.C.8 – OPEN SPACE AND CONSERVATION</p>				
<p>The project would provide for a total of 86.4 acres of natural open space. The proposed project does not conflict with the open space policies of the Riverside County General Plan; thus, there would be no direct significant impact to open space.</p>	<p>Impacts determined not to be significant.</p>	<p>Significant impacts would not occur, thus, mitigation is not required.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>SECTION V.C.9 – AGRICULTURE</p>				
<p>The project site is not designated as an agricultural preserve, although the site is located adjacent on the north side to the El Sobrante Agricultural Preserve</p>	<p>Determined to be not significant</p>	<p>Impacts would not be significant, thus, no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

SP00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
<p>No. 1.</p> <p>The project would cause development of non-agricultural uses adjacent to agriculturally zoned property, however intervening topography and separate vehicular access points would separate the two uses. A small portion of the site (14.8 acres) is identified as "Locally Important Farmland," and use of the site for dryland crop production would be precluded. This loss is not regarded as a significant direct or cumulative impact because the project would not convert Prime or Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural</p>				
<p>V.C.10 - WILDLIFE/VEGETATION</p>				
<p>The project would result in the loss of 166.58 acres of native upland scrub communities.</p> <p>The project site is located within the USFWS-designated critical habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher, thus, causing the loss of RSS habitat would be a significant impact.</p> <p>Approximately 2.08 acres of riparian communities would also be impacted by the project.</p> <p>No sensitive plant species were identified on the subject property.</p> <p>The project would result in significant direct and indirect impacts to the federally listed coastal California gnatcatcher and least Bell's vireo.</p> <p>Although not observed on site, potential impacts are also identified for the Stephens' kangaroo rat.</p>	<p>All but the project's impacts to regional wildlife movement would be reduced to below a level of significance.</p>	<p>C.10-1 In compliance with the Project's approved DBESP, Section 404 Permit (SPL-2005-01112-SJH), Regional Board Section 401 Water Quality Certification, and CDFG Streambed Alteration Agreement (1600-2005-0076-R6), the following measures shall be implemented:</p> <p>a) The Project shall avoid and conserve 13.52 acres of onsite riparian habitats and 0.22 acre of unvegetated streambed (riverine areas).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 13.52 acres of onsite riparian habitats and 0.22 acre of unvegetated streambed shall be marked as preservation areas on the grading plan, prior to issuance of a grading permit. - Prior to and during grading operations, riparian habitats and riverine areas that will be conserved adjacent to areas approved for grading shall be marked in the field by orange construction fencing. The construction contractor shall be responsible for ensuring that ground disturbance does not encroach into these areas. 	<p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department, Riverside County Building and Safety Department</p> <p>Project Construction Contractor/Riverside County Planning Department, Riverside County Building and Safety Department</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance of grading permits.</p> <p>Concurrent with construction activities.</p>
<p>Impacts from the proposed grading</p>	<p>Prior to final map recordation, the conserved riparian habitats and riverine areas shall be</p>	<p>Prior to final map recordation, the conserved riparian habitats and riverine areas shall be</p>	<p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department</p>	<p>Prior to final map recordation.</p>

SP00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
<p>activities may result in a significant impact to nesting birds.</p> <p>Regional movement for small-and medium-sized mammals would not be significantly impacted.</p> <p>Approximately 0.43 acre of Corps jurisdictional waters (including 0.03-acre of jurisdictional wetlands) would be impacted by the project. In addition, 2.45 acres of CDFG jurisdictional streambed and associated riparian habitat) would be impacted by the project.</p> <p>The proposed project would result in significant cumulative impacts on several non-sensitive plant communities and animal species within the region. The project would also contribute to the ongoing loss of sensitive habitat (willow riparian woodland, southern willow scrub/mule fat scrub, and Riversidean sage scrub) within the region.</p>		<p>marked on the Environmental Constraint Sheet.</p> <p>b)The Project Applicant shall create 8.2 acres of riparian habitat onsite, including willow woodland creation (0.40 acre), willow woodland enhancement (1.8 acres), mulefat/willow scrub restoration (0.9 acre), and saltbush/mule fat scrub restoration (5.1 acres); or The Project Applicant shall purchase 8.2 acres of mitigation credits from a Corps/CDFG approved mitigation bank; or the Project Applicant shall compensate for the loss of habitat through a combination of onsite mitigation and the purchase of credits from an offsite mitigation bank, in a total amount of no less than 8.2 acres.</p> <p>c)Approximately 11.7 acres of Riversidean sage scrub shall be restored along the onsite riparian drainages to enhance the buffer between the proposed development and the conserved riparian habitat.</p> <p>C.10-2 In compliance with the Project's approved May 16, 2006 Biological Opinion, the following measures shall be implemented to mitigate impacts to the least Bell's vireo:</p> <p>a) The removal of vegetation within onsite riparian habitats, or within 100 meters of riparian habitats, shall occur outside of the vireo breeding season (March 1 – August 31). This restriction shall be noted on all grading plans.</p> <p>b)Development lighting shall be directed away from sensitive habitats. Lighting plans shall be reviewed and approved by Riverside County prior to the approval of building permits to ensure compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>c)A native vegetation buffer shall be established between vireo habitat and development areas. The buffer shall be in place prior to the first final building inspection in Planning Area 1 or 3.</p> <p>d) An Environmental Awareness Program shall be developed and administered by the Project's</p>	<p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department, US Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Game</p> <p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department</p> <p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department, Riverside County Building and Safety Department</p> <p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department, Riverside County Building and Safety Department</p> <p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department</p> <p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permits that would result in impacts to riparian/riverine habitats or State and/or federal jurisdictional waters or wetlands.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of grading permits that would result in impacts to riparian/riverine habitats or State and/or federal jurisdictional waters or wetlands.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of grading permits</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of building permits.</p> <p>Prior to the 1st building permit final inspection in Planning Area 1 or 3.</p> <p>Prior to the 1st building permit final inspection.</p>

SP00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
		<p>Homeowners' Association to educate property owners regarding the least Bell's vireo, and other sensitive habitat issues. This requirement shall be specified in the community's CC&Rs.</p> <p>e) Access to the conserved riparian corridor shall be restricted. The County shall review and approve all wall and fencing plans prior to the issuance of building permits to ensure compliance with this requirement. The access restrictions also shall be specified in the community's CC&Rs.</p> <p>f) Cat exclusion fencing shall be installed along areas adjacent to the conserved riparian corridor. The County shall review and approve fencing plans prior to the issuance of building permits to ensure compliance with this requirement. A requirement to maintain this fence at all times shall be specified in the community's CC&Rs.</p> <p>g) The Project Applicant shall provide funding assistance for cowbird trapping in coordination with the Santa Ana Watershed Association (SAWA). Proof of funding assistance (receipt or other acceptable verification) shall be provided to the Riverside County Planning Department prior to the issuance of the first building permit.</p> <p>C.10-3 In compliance with the MSHCP Objective 6 for burrowing owls, within 30 days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey of the property and make a determination regarding the presence or absence of the burrowing owl. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies no burrowing owls on the property, a grading permit may be issued without restriction. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies the presence of at least one individual but less than three (3) mating pairs of burrowing owl, then prior to the issuance of a grading permit and prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities on the property, the qualified biologist shall relocate the burrowing owls following accepted protocols. Relocation shall occur outside of the nesting season to avoid the take of active nests. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies the presence</p>	<p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department, Riverside County Building and Safety Department</p> <p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department, Riverside County Building and Safety Department</p> <p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department</p> <p>Project Applicant, Project Biologist/Riverside County Planning Department</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance of building permits, prior to the 1st building permit final inspection.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of building permits, prior to the 1st building permit final inspection.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of the 1st building permit.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of grading permits.</p>

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
		<p>of three (3) or more mating pairs of burrowing owl, the provisions of MSHCP Species-Specific Conservation Objective 5 shall be followed.</p> <p>C.10-4 To avoid impacts to nesting birds, vegetation clearing shall be conducted outside of the nesting season (February 1st through September 15th). If avoidance of the nesting season is not feasible, then a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within 3 days prior any disturbance of the site. If active nests are identified, the biologist shall establish suitable buffers around the nests, and the buffers shall be avoided until the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.</p> <p>C.10-5 Prior to the issuance of clearing or grading permits, the Project Applicant shall pay Local Development Mitigation Fees (per County Ordinance No. 810.2) for implementation of the MSHCP.</p> <p>C.10-6 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall pay fees in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 633 (Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Fee Assessment Area) for implementation of the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan.</p>	<p>Project Applicant, Project Biologist/Riverside County Planning Department</p> <p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department, Riverside County Building and Safety Department</p> <p>Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department, Riverside County Building and Safety Department</p>	<p>Prior to the initiation of grading activities.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of grading permits.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of grading permits.</p>
<p>SECTION V.C.11 – ENERGY RESOURCES</p> <p>On-site natural gas demand for the proposed Specific Plan is estimated at 23,802,900 cubic feet (c.f.) per year, based on 79,980 c.f. per year per dwelling unit and 34.8 c.f. per acre of golf course facility uses. On-site electricity for the proposed project is estimated at 2,193,495 kilowatt hours per year (kWh/yr) based on 6.081 kWh per dwelling unit and 36.6 kWh per acre of golf course facility uses. Demand related to the project can be accommodated by the energy purveyors, and standard conditions of approval would minimize impacts to acceptable levels.</p>	<p>Determined to be not significant</p>	<p>Impacts would not be significant, thus, no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

SP00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
SECTION V.C.12 – HISTORIC AND PREHISTORIC RESOURCES				
<p><u>Archaeological</u> A total of 9 archaeological resource sites are located on the project site. Of these 9 sites, none were evaluated as significant.</p> <p><u>Paleontological</u> The Specific Plan area is situated in a terrain of Mesozoic (cretaceous) granitic rocks, revealing bare granitic exposures on the upper slopes and protruding knolls, and geologically young (Holocene) alluvial deposits in the flat areas at lower elevations. This type of geological setting would not be expected to yield significant fossiliferous deposits.</p>	<p><u>Archaeological</u> Determined to be not significant</p> <p><u>Paleontological</u> Determined to not be significant</p>	<p><u>Archaeological</u> Impacts would not be significant; thus, no mitigation is required.</p> <p><u>Paleontological</u> Impacts would not be significant; thus, no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
SECTION V.C.13 – AESTHETICS, VISUAL ANALYSIS, LIGHT AND GLARE				
<p>At build-out of the proposed project, views from the site from surrounding areas would change from predominantly vacant land to light urban residential, recreational, and open space land uses. Views of the site from adjacent areas are limited. Because the proposed project would implement specific landscape and architectural design requirements, which are directed at providing an aesthetically pleasing development (in both the residential and golf course portions of the project), visual impacts associated with the proposed Specific Plan would not be considered adverse.</p>	<p>Determined to be not significant</p>	<p>Significant visual impacts are not anticipated, and no mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
SECTION V.D.1 – CIRCULATION AND TRAFFIC				
<p>The proposed project is projected to generate a maximum total of 3,302 trip-ends. Of this total, a maximum of 259 vehicles would be generated during the AM peak hour and a maximum of 348 vehicles per hour would be generated during the PM peak hour.</p>	<p>All intersection impacts would be reduced to below a Level of significance, with the exception of the project's direct, long-term impacts at the La Sierra Avenue and Cleveland Avenue intersection. This significant, unmitigated impact would require adoption of Statements of Overriding</p>	<p>D.1-1 Prior to approval of final building permits, the applicant shall pay County of Riverside Traffic Signal Mitigation fees to offset the project's short-term impacts to intersections in the County (pursuant to Ordinance No. 748).</p> <p>D.1-2 Prior to approval of final building permits, the applicant shall use all reasonable efforts to enter into an agreement with the City of Riverside to pay</p>	<p>Riverside County Transportation Department</p> <p>Riverside County Transportation Department</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permits.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of building permits.</p>

SP00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
<p>In the short-term (2003), the proposed project's traffic would create significant impacts to three (3) intersections along La Sierra Avenue, and would require mitigation.</p> <p>In the long-term (2020), the proposed project's traffic would create significant impacts to one (1) intersection (La Sierra Avenue at Cleveland Avenue), and would require mitigation.</p>	<p>Considerations, prior to Board approval of the project.</p>	<p>standard fair-share traffic impact fees for its contribution to traffic to the La Sierra Avenue/Indiana Avenue intersection, La Sierra Avenue/Victoria Avenue intersection, and Van Buren Boulevard/Victoria Avenue intersection.</p> <p>D.1-3 Prior to approval of final building permits, the applicant shall participate in funding of off-site improvements through payment of the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF).</p>	<p>Riverside County Transportation Department</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permits.</p>
<p>SECTION V.D.2 – WATER AND SEWER SERVICES</p>				
<p>The average water demand for the proposed project is estimated to be 391,020 gallons per day.</p> <p>The proposed project would have a calculated average wastewater discharge flow of 113,190 gallons per day.</p> <p>The proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to groundwater supplies or water and wastewater facilities, and no mitigation measures are required beyond the standard conditions of approval set forth by the County.</p>	<p>Determined to be not significant</p>	<p>Significant impacts are not anticipated, and no mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>SECTION V.D.3 – FIRE SERVICES</p>				
<p>According to the Fire Department, Fire Station 82 is the primary station servicing the project area and an additional three stations would provide backup service to the site.</p> <p>Because the project site is within a designated high fire hazards area and the fire station servicing the site is outside the 5-minute response requirement, development on the site would be exposed to potentially significant impacts.</p>	<p>Below a level of significance</p>	<p>D.3-1 Prior to building permit final inspection, the applicant shall participate in the Riverside County Development Impact Fee Program (pursuant to Ordinance No. 659), which provides funds that are used by the County to fund fire protection service facilities and operations in addition to other County services.</p> <p>D.3-2 All water mains and fire hydrants providing fire flows shall be constructed in accordance with the appropriate sections of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460 and/or No. 787, subject to the approval by the Riverside County Fire Department and Lee Lake Water District. Fire flows over 3,000 gpm shall be for three hours duration.</p>	<p>Riverside County, Building and Safety and Fire Departments</p> <p>Riverside County, Building and Safety and Fire Departments</p>	<p>Prior to building permit final inspection.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of building permits.</p>

SP00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
		<p>D.3-3 All structures on-site shall be constructed with fire retardant roofing material as described in the 2010 California Fire Code. Wood shingles shall not be allowed. Cul-de-sacs exceeding the maximum length allowed by Riverside County Ordinance No. 787 shall not be allowed.</p> <p>D.3-4 Prior to building permit final inspection, the County shall conduct a field inspection to ensure that fire suppression and landscape features specified on the Project's fuel management plan have been installed at appropriate distances from structures, as detailed on a County-approved landscape plan.</p> <p>a) The required Fuel Modification Zones shall only be planted with those tree/plant species identified with a "FM" designation on the Specific Plan Plant Palette (see Table IV-2 of Specific Plan No. 325, Amendment No. 1).</p>	<p>Riverside County Fire Department</p> <p>Riverside County, Building and Safety and Fire Departments</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permits.</p> <p>Prior to building permit final inspection.</p>
SECTION V.D.4 – SHERIFF SERVICES				
<p>The proposed project would result in a population increase of 888 residents in Riverside County and would result in the need for an additional one deputy to provide adequate protection to the site.</p>	<p>Below a level of significance.</p>	<p>D.4-1 Prior to building permit final inspection, Development Mitigation Fees shall be paid as outlined in the Riverside County Development Impact Fee Program (Ordinance No. 659). The fees are used by the County to fund sheriff service facilities and operations in addition to other County services.</p> <p>D.4-2 The project applicant shall inform the Crime Prevention Unit of the Sheriff's Department of all new homeowners associations. These associations may be used as the foundation for establishing Neighborhood Watch Programs.</p> <p>D.4-3 The project proponent shall work with Riverside County Sheriff's Department to implement the principles of the COPPS program. The program may require the placement of a Sheriff's satellite office within the project site and/or would require working closely with the Home Owners' Association for the proposed project.</p>	<p>Riverside County Building and Safety and Sheriff's Departments</p> <p>Riverside County Sheriff's Department</p> <p>Riverside County Sheriff's Department, project applicant</p>	<p>Prior to building permit final inspection.</p> <p>Prior to building permit final inspection.</p> <p>Prior to building permit final inspection.</p>
SECTION V.D.5 – SCHOOLS				
<p>Elementary, middle, and high school students would attend Harrison</p>	<p>Below a level of significance.</p>	<p>D.5-1 Prior to the issuance of building-occupancy permits, the project proponent shall mitigate impacts to</p>	<p>RUSD</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permits.</p>

SP00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
<p>Elementary, Chermawa Intermediate, and Arlington High, respectively, all of which are operating above capacity. Accordingly, the additional 238 students that would be generated with implementation of the project would add to the existing capacity problems at the elementary, middle, and high schools. Thus, the proposed project would create a cumulatively significant impact to Riverside County schools.</p>		<p>schools by payment of school impact fees.</p>		
<p>V.D.6 – PARKS AND RECREATION</p>				
<p>Based on Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, Section 10.35 requirements, 4.4 acres of neighborhood community parks would be required to support residents of the proposed project. This requirement would be satisfied through the provision of 7.1 acres of active park land within the Project site. The project would provide a sufficient amount of active park space, and a significant impact to existing County and City parks and recreational facilities would not occur.</p>	<p>No significant impacts would occur</p>	<p>Parks and recreation impacts would not be significant; therefore, mitigation is not required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>SECTION V.D.7 – UTILITIES</p>				
<p>The project would create a demand for 2,097,945 kilowatt hours per year (kWh/yr) of electricity and 27,593,100 cubic feet per year of natural gas at buildout. The project would require telephone services also. All utility purveyors have indicated their ability to provide service to the site. In addition, the project would be subject to standard permit conditions which contain a number of energy-conserving measures. Thus, the project would not create significant impacts to utility providers.</p>	<p>No significant impacts would occur.</p>	<p>Utility impacts would not be significant; therefore, mitigation is not required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

SP00325A1, CZ07779, TR36390

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
<p>SECTION V.D.3 – SOLID WASTE</p> <p>Ultimate project development, as well as the construction phase of the proposed project, would increase the amount of solid waste generated in the area; in turn, shortening the life span of the affected landfills, as well as increasing the demand upon waste haulers.</p> <p>Because implementation of the project would not significantly reduce the County's capacity to process solid waste and the project would participate in the required recycling program, significant impacts to solid waste services would not occur.</p>	<p>Significant impacts are not anticipated.</p>	<p>Implementation of the standard conditions of approval, as discussed in the EIR, would ensure that impacts to solid waste facilities would not exceed thresholds of significance.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>SECTION V.D.9 - LIBRARIES</p> <p>Development of the proposed Specific Plan project would increase the region's population, in turn creating an additional demand for library facilities and services.</p> <p>The increase demand would create a significant impact to both the County and City of Riverside's public libraries' ability to serve the project's future residents. Accordingly, the proposed project would be required to mitigate the impacts.</p>	<p>Below a level of significance.</p>	<p>D.9-1 Prior to building permit final inspection, the project proponent shall pay mitigation fees in accordance with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 659. A portion of these fees may be utilized by the County to provide additional library facilities and staff.</p>	<p>Riverside County, Building and Safety Department</p>	<p>Prior to building permit final inspection.</p>
<p>SECTION V.D.10 – HEALTH SERVICES</p> <p>The increase in population of 888 people by the proposed project will generate an increase demand for in medical services, therefore, resulting in a significant cumulative impact to health care services.</p>	<p>Below a level of significance.</p>	<p>D.10-1 Prior to building permit final inspection, the project applicant shall participate in the Riverside County Development Impact Fee Program as outlined in Ordinance No. 659. The fees are used by the County to fund public health facilities and operations in addition to other County services.</p>	<p>Riverside County, Building and Safety Department</p>	<p>Prior to building permit final inspection.</p>
<p>SECTION V.D.11 – DISASTER PREPAREDNESS</p>				
<p>Fire Hazards</p>	<p>Below a level of significance</p>	<p>See Fire Services, above.</p>		
<p>Seismic Hazards</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>No impacts; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</p>		
<p>Slopes and Erosion</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>No impacts; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</p>		
<p>Wind Erosion</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>No impacts; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</p>		
<p>Flooding</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>No impacts; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</p>		

TENTATIVE MAP Tract #: TR36390

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

EVERY DEPARTMENT

10. EVERY. 1 MAP - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

RECOMMND

The land division hereby permitted a Schedule A subdivision that would subdivide 333.7 acre property into a 343 single-family residential lots, 8 park lots, 3 water quality detention basin lots, and 43 open space lots (394 total)

10. EVERY. 2 MAP - HOLD HARMLESS

RECOMMND

The applicant/permittee or any successor-in-interest shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County of Riverside or its agents, officers, and employees (COUNTY) from the following:

(a) any claim, action, or proceeding against the COUNTY to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the COUNTY, its advisory agencies, appeal boards, or legislative body concerning the TENTATIVE MAP, which action is brought within the time period provided for in California Government Code, Section 66499.37; and,

(b) any claim, action or proceeding against the COUNTY to attack, set aside, void or annul any other decision made by the COUNTY concerning the TENTATIVE MAP, including, but not limited to, decisions made in response to California Public Records Act requests.

The COUNTY shall promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense. If the COUNTY fails to promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding or fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant/permittee shall not, thereafter, be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the COUNTY.

The obligations imposed by this condition include, but are not limited to, the following: the applicant/permittee shall pay all legal services expenses the COUNTY incurs in connection with any such claim, action or proceeding, whether it incurs such expenses directly, whether it is ordered by a court to pay such expenses, or whether it incurs such expenses by providing legal services through its Office of County Counsel.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

5. DRT CORRECTIONS REQUIRED

EPD DEPARTMENT

5.EPD. 1

DRT - MSHCP COMPLIANCE

REQUIRED

Other MSHCP Compliance Requirements

[X] This case falls within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRMSHCP) and is required to provide documentation to comply with the WRMSHCP requirements listed below prior to scheduling this case for any public hearing.

A habitat suitability assessment(s) and potentially focused survey(s) for the following species is required to complete WRMSHCP review:

Riparian Riverine Area and Vernal Pool Species (WRMSHCP, Section 6.1.2)

[X] An assessment onsite pursuant to Section 6.1.2, shall include the identification and mapping of all Riparian Riverine and Vernal Pool features and a description of the functions and values of the mapped areas with respect the species listed under the "Purpose". Factors to be considered include hydrologic regime, flood storage and flood flow modification, nutrient retention and transformation, sediment trapping and transport, toxicant trapping, public use, wildlife Habitat, and aquatic Habitat. The functions and values assessment will identify areas that should be considered for priority acquisition for the MSHCP Conservation Area, as well as those that affect downstream values of related to Conservation of Covered Species.

If the mapping required in Section 6.1.2 identifies suitable habitat for any of the six species listed below and the proposed project design does not incorporate avoidance of the identified habitat; focused surveys shall be required.

- Least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*)
- Southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*)
- Western yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*)
- Riverside fairy shrimp (*Streptocephalus woottoni*)
- Santa Rosa Plateau fairy Shrimp (*Linderiella santarosae*)
- Vernal Pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*)

All Riparian/Riverine, Vernal Pools and other species suitable habitat identified onsite shall be delineated on

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

5. DRT CORRECTIONS REQUIRED

5.EPD. 1

DRT - MSHCP COMPLIANCE (cont.)

REQUIRED

the proposed project exhibit submitted for the Planning Department application process.

Narrow Endemic Plant Species (WRMSHCP, Section 6.1.3)

- Brand's phacelia (*Phacelia stellaris*)
- California Orcutt grass (*Orcuttia californica*)
- Hammitt's clay-cress (*Sibaropsis hammittii*)
- Johnston's rock cress (*Arabis johnstonii*)
- many-stemmed dudleya (*Dudleya multicaulis*)
- Munz's mariposa lily (*Calochortus palmeri* var. *munzii*)
- Munz's onion (*Allium munzii*)
- San Diego ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila*)
- San Jacinto mountain bedstraw (*Galium angustifolium* ssp. *jacinticum*)
- San Miguel savory (*Satureja chandleri*)
- slender-horned spine flower (*Dodecahema leptocerus*)
- spreading navarretia (*Navarretia fossalis*)
- Wright's trichocoronis (*Trichocoronis wrightii* var. *wrightii*)
- Yucaipa onion (*Allium marvinii*)

Criteria Area Species with Additional Survey Requirements (WRMSHCP, Section 6.3.2)

- Coulter's goldfields (*Lasthenia glabrata* ssp. *coulteri*)
- Davidson saltscale (*Atriplex serenana* var. *davidsonii*)
- heart-leaved pitcher sage (*Lepechinia cardiophylla*)
- little mousetail (*Myosurus minimus*)
- mud nama (*Nama stenocarpum*)
- Nevin's barberry (*Berberis nevinii*)
- Parish's brittlescale (*Atriplex parishii*)
- prostrate navarretia (*Navarretia prostrata*)
- round-leaved filaree (*Erodium macrophyllum*)
- San Jacinto Valley crownscale (*Atriplex coronator* var. *notatior*)
- smooth tarplant (*Centromadia pungens*)
- thread-leaved brodiaea (*Brodiaea filifolia*)
- Vail Lake ceanothus (*Ceanothus ophiochilus*)
- arroyo toad (*Bufo californicus*)
- California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*)
- mountain yellow-legged frog (*Rana mucosa*)
- burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*)
- Aguanga kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys merriami collinus*)
- San Bernardino kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys merriami parvus*)
- Los Angeles pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris*)

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

5. DRT CORRECTIONS REQUIRED

5.EPD. 1 DRT - MSHCP COMPLIANCE (cont.) (cont.) REQUIRED

brevinasus)

[] Delhi Sand flower-loving fly (*Rhaphiomidas terminatus abominalis*)

-- Focused surveys for the plant species listed above may only be undertaken during the blooming period during years with at least normal rainfall (WRMSHCP, Section 6.1.3, page 6-31).

Each specific species account should be reviewed in the WRMSHCP Volume 2 Reference Document, Section B, for specific species conservation objectives.

[X] Urban Wildland Interface Guidelines (WRMSHCP, Section 6.1.4)

If the proposed project is located in proximity to WRMSHCP Conservation Area which may result in Edge Effects that would adversely affect biological resources an Urban/Wildlife Interface Guideline analysis will need to be prepared. (See WRMSHCP - Section 6.1.4, pages 6-42 through 6-46). Edge effects associated with existing and future land uses in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area shall address:

"Drainage

"Toxics

"Lighting

"Noise

"Invasive landscape species

"Barriers

"Grading/Land Development

Please refer to the draft Biological Procedures located at for report guidelines. To view the WRMSHCP online go to EPD link www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/epd/intro_mshcp.html. The EPD requires biological consultants to have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on file with the County prior to any work being performed for an applicant.

5.EPD. 2 DRT - GENERAL BIO ASSESSMENT REQUIRED

The proposed project requires a general biological assessment. The document shall focus primarily on biological impacts not covered under the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

If you have any questions, please contact Chad Young at

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

5. DRT CORRECTIONS REQUIRED

5.EPD. 2 DRT - GENERAL BIO ASSESSMENT (cont.) REQUIRED
(951) 955-8159.

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

EVERY DEPARTMENT

10. EVERY. 2 SPA - Amendment Description RECOMMND

SPECIFIC PLAN Amendment No. 1 will eliminate the planned golf course and clubhouse, increase the amount of open space, park acreage, and the maximum number of permitted single-family homes, and add storm water quality/detention facility improvements.

Specifically, the SPECIFIC PLAN would involve the following:

- 1) Reduce the approved grading footprint for the SPECIFIC PLAN (exclusive of grading required for Street "A") from approximately 254.7 acres to approximately 207.6 acres, a reduction of 47.1 acres.
- 2) Eliminate the approved 119.1-acre golf course and 3.5-acre golf course clubhouse from the SPECIFIC PLAN.
- 3) Increase areas planned for open space from 85.2 acres to 162.4 acres.
- 4) Increase the area planned for parks from 2.5 acres to 7.0 acres.
- 5) Develop a portion of the property with 345 single-family residential homes at a maximum gross density of 1.0 dwelling units per acre.
- 6) Develop 2.9 acres of storm water drainage/water quality detention facilities on the subject property while retaining existing drainage characteristics.

Additionally, Specific Plan No. 325, and SPECIFIC PLAN Amendment No. 1 in conjunction with the original EIR 433 and subsequent Addendum (Number 1) planned for and evaluated the construction and operation of an off-site road called "Street 'A'." Concurrent with the Project Applicant's proposals, the Riverside County Transportation Department is processing Capital Project Work Order No. C1-

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 2

SPA - Amendment Description (cont.)

RECOMMND

0641 to construct Street "A" between McAllister Street and Van Buren Boulevard (approximately 7,600 linear feet), with a short segment traversing and providing access to the Citrus Heights property. In addition to providing access to the SPECIFIC PLAN, Street "A" is intended to improve operational efficiency of the surrounding roadway network. Street "A" is classified as a "Collector" Road by the General Plan Circulation Elements of both the County of Riverside and the City of Riverside, with approximately 40 percent of the planned roadway alignment being located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the County of Riverside and approximately 60 percent of the planned roadway alignment being located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of Riverside. A multi-use trail would be constructed on the eastern edge of Street "A" between the northern and southern access points of the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e., proposed Street "A" and Street "C").

10. EVERY. 3

SPA - Replace all previous

RECOMMND

This Specific Plan Amendment is intended to replace the original SPECIFIC PLAN, and all amendments and substantial conformances to the SPECIFIC PLAN. All future developments within the SPECIFIC PLAN, whether or not they have a direct correlation to this Amendment, will inherit these conditions. The original SPECIFIC PLAN and all previous amendments and substantial conformances to the SPECIFIC PLAN will be electronically "locked" so that all future land development applications comply with the following conditions:

10. EVERY. 4

SP - SP Document

RECOMMND

Specific Plan No. 325A1 shall include the following:

a. Specific Plan Document, which shall include:

1. Board of Supervisors Specific Plan Resolution including the Mitigation Reporting/Monitoring Program
2. Conditions of Approval.
3. Specific Plan Zoning Ordinance.
4. Land Use Plan in both 8 1/2" x 11" black-and-white and 11" x 17" color formats.
5. Specific Plan text.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 4 SP - SP Document (cont.)

RECOMMND

6. Descriptions of each Planning Area in both graphical and narrative formats.

b. Final Environmental Impact Report No. 433 and Addendum No. 1, which must include, but not be limited to, the following items:

1. Mitigation Monitoring/Reporting Program.
2. Draft EIR
3. Comments received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.
4. A list of person, organizations and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.
5. Responses of the County to significant environmental point raised in the review and consultation process.
6. Technical Appendices

If any specific plan conditions of approval differ from the specific plan text or exhibits, the specific plan conditions of approval shall take precedence.

10. EVERY. 5 SP - Definitions

RECOMMND

The words identified in the following list that appear in all capitals in the attached conditions of Specific Plan No. 325A1 shall be henceforth defined as follows:

SPECIFIC PLAN = Specific Plan No. 325, Amendment No. 1, Dated 8/22/13

CHANGE OF ZONE = Change of Zone No. 7779.

EIR = Environmental Impact Report No. 433 and Addendum No. 1.

10. EVERY. 6 SP - Ordinance Requirements

RECOMMND

The development of the property shall be in accordance with the mandatory requirements of all Riverside County ordinances including Ordinance Nos. 348 and 460 and state laws; and shall conform substantially with the adopted SPECIFIC PLAN as filed in the office of the Riverside County Planning Department, unless otherwise amended.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 7 SP - Limits of SP DOCUMENT

RECOMMND

No portion of the SPECIFIC PLAN which purports or proposes to change, waive or modify any ordinance or other legal requirement for the development shall be considered to be part of the adopted specific plan. Notwithstanding o above, the design guidelines and development standards of the SPECIFIC PLAN or hillside development and grading shall apply in place of more general County guidelines and standards.

10. EVERY. 8 SP - HOLD HARMLESS

RECOMMND

The applicant/permittee or any successor-in-interest shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County of Riverside or its agents, officers, and employees (COUNTY) from the following:

(a) any claim, action, or proceeding against the COUNTY to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the COUNTY, its advisory agencies, appeal boards, or legislative body concerning the SPECIFIC PLAN; and,

(b) any claim, action or proceeding against the COUNTY to attack, set aside, void or annul any other decision made by the COUNTY concerning the SPECIFIC PLAN, including, but not limited to, decisions made in response to California Public Records Act requests.

The COUNTY shall promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense. If the COUNTY fails to promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding or fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant/permittee shall not, thereafter, be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the COUNTY.

The obligations imposed by this condition include, but are not limited to, the following: the applicant/permittee shall pay all legal services expenses the COUNTY incurs in connection with any such claim, action or proceeding, whether it incurs such expenses directly, whether it is ordered by a court to pay such expenses, or whether it incurs such expenses by providing legal services through its Office of County Counsel.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

10.BS GRADE. 1 SP-GSP-1 ORD. NOT SUPERSEDED RECOMMND

Anything to the contrary, proposed by this Specific Plan, shall not supersede the following: All grading shall conform to the California Building code, County General Plan, Ordinance 457 and all other relevant laws, rules and regulations governing grading in Riverside County.

10.BS GRADE. 2 SP-GSP-2 GEO/SOIL TO BE OBEYED RECOMMND

All grading shall be performed in accordance with the recommendations of the included -County approved- geotechnical/soils reports for this Specific Plan.

10.BS GRADE. 3 SP-ALL CLEARNC'S REQ'D B-4 PMT RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of a grading permit, all certifications affecting grading shall have written clearances. This includes, but is not limited to, additional environmental assessments, erosion control plans, geotechnical/soils reports, and departmental clearances.

FLOOD RI DEPARTMENT

10.FLOOD RI. 1 SP SP FLOOD HAZARD REPORT RECOMMND

Specific Plan 325, Amendment No. 1, is a proposal to eliminate the proposed golf course and clubhouse to the previously approved SP 325 and add additional residential units and open space. This specific plan encompassed approximately 333-acres and is located in the Lake Mathews area easterly of McAllister Street and southerly of Van Buren Boulevard. Specific Plan 325 was previously named the Lake Mathews Golf and Country Club Specific Plan. It is being renamed the Citrus Heights Specific Plan with this amendment. The site was also previously reviewed as Parcel Map 30154 and Tract 30153.

The topography of the area consists of well defined ridges and natural watercourses that traverse the site. Situated in the central portion of the specific plan, but not a part of the specific plan, is the District's Harrison Dam (Project No. 1-0-0040) located within an approximately 20-acre property owned by the District. Legal access in the form of right of way, easements or an agreement to provide unrestricted maintenance access to the dam,

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.FLOOD RI. 1

SP SP FLOOD HAZARD REPORT (cont.)

RECOMMND

including provisions for the upstream and downstream toe of the embankment as well as the top of the embankment, will be required. This legal access will be in a form approved by the District prior to the recordation of any maps or the issuance of grading or building permits. The inundation area for the dam extends into portions of the specific plan. The stage-to-storage relationship of the dam is critical for the dam to function properly. Fill will not be allowed within the impoundment area unless otherwise approved by the District. An encroachment permit will be required for any work within District property.

The original drainage plan of SP 325 consisted of leaving the major watercourses unobstructed except for road culvert crossings. The Amendment No. 1 document takes a different, more structural approach. The Master Drainage Plan shows that in addition to large culverts at road crossings, several storm drain systems are also proposed. Also included in the Master Drainage Plan are three (3) water quality basins. Offsite flows are collected and conveyed through the development and discharged into the natural watercourses. The internal drainage of the development is divided into 3 drainage sub-areas. The initial runoff from each sub-area is collected and conveyed in a storm drain that is then discharged into its respective water quality basin. Larger storm events within the sub-areas are collected and conveyed through the development in a storm drain system and discharged into the natural water courses.

It has been indicated that no phasing of the construction is proposed and the whole site will be mass graded and improvements, including all drainage facilities, will be constructed at one time. Should phasing occur, the necessary drainage and water quality basins improvements must be constructed so each phase is protected from storm runoff and appropriate water quality mitigation measures are built.

The District has reviewed the Master Drainage Plan of the Citrus Heights Specific Plan and found it acceptable. More detailed comments and reviews will be provided with the Conditions of Approval for Tract 36390.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.FLOOD RI. 2 SP CONST WQ BASINS & SD SYSTEM RECOMMND

If the development is constructed in phases or stages, the water quality basins and the drainage infrastructure/storm drain system for each phase or stage must be constructed to provide the appropriate water quality mitigation and protection from the 100-year tributary storm flows.

10.FLOOD RI. 3 SP FINAL WQMP/LID RECOMMND

The preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) submitted in August 2012 followed the format that was currently in effect at the time of submittal. However, as of October 22, 2012, all projects must comply with the latest MS4 permit WQMP Guidance Manual and Template for the Santa Ana River Watershed. All future WQMP submittals shall comply with the latest WQMP and Low Impact Design (LID) provisions by incorporating LID principles and prioritized/tier selection of mitigation or structural site design. Lid principles should be used on each lot and common open space areas in an effort to reduce the size of the project's BMP's.

10.FLOOD RI. 4 SP DAM INUNDATION AREA RECOMMND

No fill slopes or grading that would negatively impact the existing stage-to-storage relationship will be permitted within the dam inundation area.

10.FLOOD RI. 5 SP LEGAL ACCESS TO DAM RECOMMND

Legal access in the form of right of way, easements or an agreement which provides the District unlimited and unencumbered vehicular access to the District's Harrison Dam shall be executed prior to the recordation of any maps or the issuance of grading or building permits.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

10.PLANNING. 1 SP - PDP01436 RECOMMND

County Paleontological Report (PDP) No. 1436, submitted for this case (TR36390 & SP00325A1), was prepared by Brian F. Smithy and Associates, inc. and is entitled: "Preliminary Paleontological Resources Impact Assessment for the Lake Mathews 330 Project Site, Unincorporated Riverside County, California", dated 6 March 2012.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 1 SP - PDP01436 (cont.)

RECOMMND

PDP01436 concluded:

1.The rock units mapped across the property are dominantly mixed and undifferentiated granodiorite and gabbro, with smaller outcrops of hornblende gabbro and undifferentiated granite. The northeast portions of the property are mainly biotite schist of undifferentiated Mesozoic age.

2.No sedimentary rock units that are likely to yield any fossiliferous materials are present within the property.

3.There is no likelihood that any fossiliferous deposits of any sort are present at the site.

PDP01436 recommended:

1.Implementation of a paleontological monitoring, mitigation and reporting program should not be required.

PDP01436 satisfies the requirement for a Paleontological Resources Assessment for this project. PDP01436 is hereby accepted for TR36390 & SP00325A1. Should fossils be encountered during construction of this project, a qualified paleontologist should be employed to assess the significance of the fossils and to salvage them as appropriate and as described elsewhere in this conditions set.

Pursuant to the County's SABER (Safeguard Artifacts Being Excavated in Riverside County) Policy, paleontological fossils found in the County of Riverside should, by preference, be directed to the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet.

10.PLANNING. 2 MAP- PDA4787, 4800, 4801. 4802

RECOMMND

County Archaeological Report (PDA) No. 4801 submitted for this project (TR36390, SP00325A1) was prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates and is entitled: "A Cultural Resources Study for the McAllister Hills Golf and Country Club Specific Plan" dated April 10th, 2001.

County Archaeological Report (PDA) No. 4802 submitted for this project (TR36390, SP00325A1) was prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates and is entitled: "A Cultural

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 2 MAP- PDA4787, 4800, 4801. 4802 (cont.) RECOMMND

Resources Survey of the Van Buren Boulevard Collector Project in Association with the Lake Mathews Golf and Country Club," dated September 25, 2002.

County Archaeological Report (PDA) No. 4800 submitted for this project (TR36390, SP00325A1) was prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates and is entitled: "Cultural Resources Update Letter for Lake Mathews 330 Project, Riverside County," dated March 5, 2012.

County Archaeological Report (PDA) No. 4787 submitted for this project (TR36390, SP00325A1) was prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates and is entitled: "Cultural Resources Study of the Fairway Drive Project & Confidential Appendix," dated April 11, 2013.

All these documents have been incorporated as part of the project.

10.PLANNING. 3 SP - MAINTAIN AREAS & PHASES RECOMMND

All planning area and phase numbers shall be maintained throughout the life of the SPECIFIC PLAN, unless changed through the approval of a specific plan amendment or specific plan substantial conformance accompanied by a revision to the complete specific plan document.

10.PLANNING. 4 SP - NO P.A. DENSITY TRANSPER RECOMMND

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

10.PLANNING. 5 SP - GEO02307 RECOMMND

County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 2307 submitted for this project (TR36390) was prepared by Alta California Geotechnical, Inc. (ACGI) and is entitled: "Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Lake Mathews Project, Tentative Tract 36390, County of Riverside, California", dated October 3, 2012. In addition ACGI submitted the following:

"Response to Riverside County Plan Review Comments, Lake Matthews Project, Tentative Tract 36390, County of Riverside, California", dated January 25, 2013.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. PLANNING. 5 SP - GEO02307 (cont.)

RECOMMND

"Response to the Second County of Riverside Plan Review Comments, Lake Matthews Project, Tentative Tract 36390, County of Riverside, California", dated January 25, 2013.

These documents are herein incorporated as a part of GEO02307.

GEO02307 concluded:

1. Active faults are not present onsite.
2. The potential for surface rupture at the site is considered remote.
3. The subject site has a very low potential for liquefaction.
4. There is a potential for debris flow at the site.
5. The majority of the project is located at an elevation higher than the inundation line.
6. Tsunami should not impact this development.
7. Landslides are not present on site.
8. The majority of the free boulders on site will be removed during grading. There will be a minimal potential for boulder roll/rockfall onsite.
9. Cut slopes within bedrock are anticipated to be stable as designed.
10. Blasting is anticipated to be required for this development.

GEO02307 recommended:

1. Brow ditches will be added to the Tentative Tract Map at the top of manufactured slopes in potential debris flow areas. The project hydrologist should review drainage patterns and determine the most appropriate method of debris flow control.
2. Observations during grading should be made to verify that anticipated stable conditions are present relative to

SP-IFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 5 SP - GEO02307 (cont.) (cont.)

RECOMMND

landsliding.

3.An evaluation for boulder roll/rockfall should be performed during construction.

4.The following blast design restrictions should be adopted in specifications for the work:

- a.Blast-hole diameter should not exceed 4.0 inches.
- b.Charge-weight-per-delay should be established using scaled distance limitations to assure that PPV does not exceed 0.5 in/s at residential property, 2.0 in/s at the Earthen Dam, and 3.0 in/s in ground above buried utilities.
- c.Maximum charge-per-delay should not exceed 15 pounds.
- d.Minimum confining rock burden on all charges shall be at least 25 charge-diameters.
- e.All charges shall be stemmed with at least 25 charge-diameters of clean washed crushed stone.
- f.The maximum amount of explosives used in individual blasts should not exceed 10,000 pounds. With rock densities of approximately 2.4 tons/cu.yard or less, quantity of rock per blast would not exceed 24,000 tons.
- g.Height of blasted rock benches should not exceed 40 feet.

GEO No. 2307 satisfies the requirement for a fault study for Planning/CEQA purposes. GEO No. 2307 is hereby accepted for Planning purposes. Engineering and other Uniform Building Code parameters were not included as a part of this review or approval. This approval is not intended and should not be misconstrued as approval for grading permit. Engineering and other building code parameters should be reviewed and additional comments and/or conditions may be imposed by the City upon application for grading and/or building permits.

An environmental constraints sheet (ECS) shall be prepared, as described elsewhere in this conditions set, relative to the debris flow, rockfall and blasting issues at this site.

10.PLANNING. 6 SP- PDA4809 ARCHAEO STUDY

RECOMMND

10. Planning. General Conditions
INFORMATIONAL:

County Archaeological Report (PDA) No. 04809, submitted for this project (TR36390, SP00325A1) was prepared by Brian F. Smith by Brian F. Smith and Associates and is entitled: "A Phase I and Phase II Cultural Resource Study for the Citrus

SP-0325A1 Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 6

SP- PDA4809 ARCHAEO STUDY (cont.)

RECOMMND

Heights/Fairway Drive Project" dated July 23, 2013. This report, which is a combined report including all the previous studies completed for the project, (PDAs 4801, 4802, 4800, 4787), has been incorporated as part of the project.

During the Phase I survey of the property in 2001, the consultant evaluated nine archaeological sites, all prehistoric (CA-RIV-326, -2568, -2569, 2570, -3082, -3851, -3853, -6650, -6651) within the project area. During March of 2013 a survey of the proposed alignment for Street "A" (referred to as Fairway Drive) and associated with the Citrus Heights Project, was conducted resulting in the identification testing and evaluation of two historic period sites (CA-RIV-11,302 and -11,303 and the identification of one prehistoric isolate (P-33-021732). This results in a total of eleven archaeological sites in the project area. Five of the eleven sites can be avoided (CA-RIV-3082, -3853, -6650, -6651, and 11,302). However, six of the eleven sites will be impacted (CA-RIV-326, -2568, -2569, -2570, -3851, and -11,303) as well as one prehistoric isolate (P-33-021732).

The report concludes that none of the sites are significant per CEQA criteria. Additionally, the isolate is a non-significant cultural resource. Hence, based on this information, it has been determined that there is no significant effect on the environment pertaining to cultural resources. No site-specific mitigation measures are required, however a mitigation and monitoring program will be required for the project for which an Archaeologist and Native American Monitor will monitor grading activities in the project area.

This condition shall not modify any approved condition of approval or mitigation measure.

10.PLANNING. 7

SP-INADVERTENT ARCHAEO FINDS

RECOMMND

INADVERTENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIND

The developer/permit holder or any successor in interest shall comply with the following for the life of this permit:

If during ground disturbance activities, cultural resources* are discovered that were not assessed by the

SP-IFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. PLANNING. 7

SP-INADVERTENT ARCHAEO FINDS (cont.)

RECOMMND

archaeological report(s) and/or environmental assessment conducted prior to project approval, the following procedures shall be followed:

1) All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resource shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the project archaeologist**, the Native American tribal representative (or other appropriate ethnic/cultural group representative), and the County Archaeologist to discuss the significance of the find.

2) The developer shall call the County Archaeologist immediately upon discovery of the cultural resource to convene the meeting.

3) At the meeting with the aforementioned parties, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed and a decision is to be made, with the concurrence of the County Archaeologist, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc) for the cultural resource.

4) Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until a meeting has been convened with the aforementioned parties and a decision is made, with the concurrence of the County Archaeologist, as to the appropriate mitigation measures.

* A cultural resources site is defined, for this condition, as being three or more artifacts in close association with each other, but may include fewer artifacts if the area of the find is determined to be of significance due to its sacred or cultural importance.

** If not already employed by the project developer, a County approved archaeologist shall be employed by the project developer to assess the value/importance of the cultural resource, attend the meeting described above, and continue monitoring of all future site grading activities as necessary.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

TRANS DEPARTMENT

10.TRANS. 1 SP - SP325A1/TS CONDITIONS

RECOMMEND

The Transportation Department has reviewed the traffic study submitted for the referenced project. The study has been prepared in accordance with County-approved guidelines. We generally concur with the findings relative to traffic impacts.

The General Plan circulation policies require a minimum of Level of Service 'C', except that Level of Service 'D' may be allowed in community development areas at intersections of any combination of secondary highways, major highways, arterials, urban arterials, expressways or state highways and ramp intersections.

The study indicates that it is possible to achieve adequate levels of service for the following intersections based on the traffic study assumptions.

La Sierra Avenue (NS) at:

- SR-91 Westbound Ramps (EW)
- SR-91 Eastbound Ramps (EW)
- Indiana Avenue (EW)
- Victoria Avenue (EW)
- McAllister Parkway (EW)
- El Sobrante Road

McAllister Street (NS) at:

- Fairway Drive (EW) - Future Intersection
- El Sobrante Road (EW)

Driveway 1 (NS) at:

- Fairway Drive (EW) - Future Intersection

Driveway 2 (NS) at:

- Fairway Drive (EW) - Future Intersection

SR-91 Eastbound Ramps (NS) at:

- Indiana Avenue (EW)

Van Buren Boulevard (NS) at:

- SR-91 Westbound Ramps (EW)
- SR-91 Eastbound Ramps (EW)
- Indiana Avenue (EW)
- Victoria Avenue (EW)
- Dufferin Avenue (EW)

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.TRANS. 1 SP - SP325A1/TS CONDITIONS (cont.)

RECOMMND

Fairway Drive (EW) - Future Intersection

As such, the proposed project is consistent with this General Plan policy.

The associated conditions of approval incorporate mitigation measures identified in the traffic study, which are necessary to achieve or maintain the required level of service.

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

20.PLANNING. 1 SP - 90 DAYS TO PROTEST

RECOMMND

The applicant has ninety (90) days from the date of the approval of these conditions to protest, in accordance with the procedures set forth in Government Code Section 66020, the imposition of any and all fees, dedications, reservations, and/or exactions imposed on this project as a result of the approval or conditional approval of this project.

20.PLANNING. 2 SP - SUBMIT FINAL DOCUMENTS

RECOMMND

Within 60 days of the approval of the project by the Board of Supervisors and prior to closing the DBF accounts for the project, the project applicant shall submit, or cause to be submitted, four (4) hard copies and fifteen (15) copies on CD of the FINAL SPECIFIC PLAN and EIR documents to the Planning Department for review, approval and distribution.

The Final Specific Plan Document shall include, but is not limited to, the following items:

1. Board adopted Resolution certifying the Specific Plan and Environmental Impact Report including the Mitigation Reporting/Monitoring Program, certify by the Clerk of the Board;
2. Conditions of Approval, in an "Ineffect" status, of the Specific Plan;
3. The Adopted Specific Plan Zoning Ordinance text and

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

20.PLANNING. 2 SP - SUBMIT FINAL DOCUMENTS (cont.)

RECOMMND

final zoning map, certified by the Clerk of the Board;

4. The approved Specific Plan text and graphics; and,

5. Any other information or documentation, as determined necessary by the Planning Director.

The Final Environmental Impact Report Document shall include, but is not be limited to, the following items:

1. Adopted Mitigation Monitoring/Reporting Program;

2. Draft EIR;

3. Comments received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary;

4. A list of person, organizations and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR;

5. Responses of the County to significant environmental point raised in the review and consultation process;

6. Technical Appendices of the Draft EIR; and,

7. Any other information or documentation, as determined necessary by the Planning Director.

The Planning Department shall distribute the FINAL SP/EIR documents in the following fashion:

One hard copy to the Planning Deapartment's Public Counter Services Division,

One hard copy to the Planning Department Central Files Library,

One hard copy to the Planning Department Project Manager,

Digital versions (CD) to the following:

Building and Safety Department - 1 copy

Department of Environmental Health - 1 copy

Fire Department - 1 copy

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

20.PLANNING. 2 SP - SUBMIT FINAL DOCUMENTS (cont.) (cont.) RECOMMND

Flood Control and Water Conservation District - 1 copy

Transportation Department - 1 copy

Executive Office - CSA Administrator - 1 copy

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors - 1 copy

Any parks provider, if not the CSA - 1 copy

Any and all remaining FINAL SPECIFIC PLAN AND EIR Documents shall be kept with the Planning Department in Riverside, or as otherwise determined by the Planning Director.

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

PARKS DEPARTMENT

30.PARKS. 1 SP - TRAIL PLANS RECOMMND

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

Prior to or in conjunction with the issuance of grading permits, the applicant must have recorded necessary easements and submitted its trail plans, for the 10' Regional Trail along McAllister Street, and other regional, secondary, and rural trails within the tract, to the Regional Park and Open-Space District and received approval of said plan. The trails exhibit/plan shall show the trail with all topography, grading, ADA compliance, fencing, cross sections, signage, pavement makings, street crossings signage, bollards (if applicable) and landscaping and irrigation.

Prior to final grading inspection, the applicant is required to have graded the proposed project site in accordance with the grading plan and comply with the conditions of the Regional Park and Open-Space District's approved trail plans. The Regional Park and Open-Space District, in conjunction with a representative from Riverside County Department of Building and Safety Department Grading Division, shall inspect the proposed

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PARKS. 1 SP - TRAIL PLANS (cont.)

RECOMMND

project site in order to ensure that trail grading meets the County standards as determined by the Park District and in conjunction with the Building and Safety Department Grading Division.

Prior to or in conjunction with the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall begin construction of the regional, secondary, and rural trails as shown on the trail plans approved by the District. The applicant shall arrange for an inspection of the constructed trail with the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District.

Prior to the issuance of the 50th building permit of any Planning Area, the applicant shall provide written documentation to the Riverside County Planning Department and the Regional Park and Open-Space District that a trail maintenance mechanism is in place.

Prior to or in conjunction with building permit final inspection approvals, the applicant shall complete construction of the regional, secondary, and rural trails with all requirements of the trail plans being met and provide written documentation the trail maintenance mechanism is in place. The application shall coordinate a final inspection with the Regional Park and Open-Space District.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

30.PLANNING. 1 SP - LOW PALEO

RECOMMND

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

"According to the County's General Plan, this site has been mapped as having a "Low" and an "Undetermined" Potential for paleontological resources at this site. However, paleontological assessment report (PDP) No. 01346 concluded a low potential for encountering fossil remains due to the presence of mainly granitic and metamorphic bedrock at this site. As such, this project is not anticipated to require any direct mitigation for paleontological resources. However, should fossil remains be encountered during site development:

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 1

SP - LOW PALEO (cont.)

RECOMMEND

1.All site earthmoving shall be ceased in the area of where the fossil remains are encountered. Earthmoving activities may be diverted to other areas of the site.

2.The owner of the property shall be immediately notified of the fossil discovery who will in turn immediately notify the County Geologist of the discovery.

3.The applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist approved by the County of Riverside.

4.The paleontologist shall determine the significance of the encountered fossil remains.

5.Paleontological monitoring of earthmoving activities will continue thereafter on an as-needed basis by the paleontologist during all earthmoving activities that may expose sensitive strata. Earthmoving activities in areas of the project area where previously undisturbed strata will be buried but not otherwise disturbed will not be monitored. The supervising paleontologist will have the authority to reduce monitoring once he/she determines the probability of encountering any additional fossils has dropped below an acceptable level.

6.If fossil remains are encountered by earthmoving activities when the paleontologist is not onsite, these activities will be diverted around the fossil site and the paleontologist called to the site immediately to recover the remains.

7.Any recovered fossil remains will be prepared to the point of identification and identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible by knowledgeable paleontologists. The remains then will be curated (assigned and labeled with museum* repository fossil specimen numbers and corresponding fossil site numbers, as appropriate; places in specimen trays and, if necessary, vials with completed specimen data cards) and catalogued, an associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data will be archived (specimen and site numbers and corresponding data entered into appropriate museum repository catalogs and computerized data bases) at the museum repository by a laboratory technician. The remains will then be accessioned into the museum repository fossil

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 1 SP - LOW PALEO (cont.) (cont.)

RECOMMND

collection, where they will be permanently stored, maintained, and, along with associated specimen and site data, made available for future study by qualified scientific investigators. * Per the County of Riverside "SABER Policy", paleontological fossils found in the County of Riverside should, by preference, be directed to the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet.

8.The property owner and/or applicant on whose land the paleontological fossils are discovered shall provide appropriate funding for monitoring, reporting, delivery and curating the fossils at the institution where the fossils will be placed, and will provide confirmation to the County that such funding has been paid to the institution."

30.PLANNING. 2 SP - LANDSCAPE CONCEPTUAL PLAN

RECOMMND

30 LC LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLAN

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

Provide 2 sets of plans on 24" x 36" sheets at 20 scale that include a title block, north arrow, limit of work lines, hardscape features, graphic scale, street names, elevation drawings etc. The plan shall clearly depict concept designs and theme elements for the expected future final landscaping, shading, and parking plan (the final planting and irrigation plans would normally be submitted as a Transportation IP case and approved prior to the issuance of building permits). For guidance, please review Section 18.12, Sections 19.300 through 19.304 of Ordinance No. 348, Ordinance No. 859 (as adopted and any amendments thereto), and the Riverside County Guide to California Friendly Landscaping. No irrigation system information is required at the conceptual landscape phase.

Conceptual landscape plan shall also provide information on the size, number, genus, species, common name, spacing, plant factor, size, and symbol of trees, bushes and groundcover to be provided within landscaped areas and in other open space areas within the project. Top dressing(s) should be described, including the areas devoted to living groundcovers. All plants must be selected from the

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 2 SP - LANDSCAPE CONCEPTUAL PLAN (cont.) RECOMMND

Riverside County California Friendly Plant List. Special features, such as rockwork, fencing, water features, recreational trails, MSCHP regulated areas, etc. shall be identified. The Conceptual Landscape Plan shall consider existing landscaping on adjacent and nearby properties and provide a logical transition to the on-site landscaping concepts with designs to prevent abrupt contrasts between properties.

If impacts to on-site or nearby biological resources require special treatments, the planting plans shall be reviewed and approved by a professional biologist from the County's official list.

If the project is in the Coachella Valley, the landscape architect shall coordinate with the Riverside County Agricultural Commissioner's for a current list of quarantine plant materials. The number for the Agricultural Commissioner's office is 760-863-8291.

The Conceptual Landscape Plan shall be prepared in a professional manner by a California Licensed Landscape Architect.

30.PLANNING. 3 SP - M/M PROGRAM (GENERAL) RECOMMND

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

"The EIR prepared for the SPECIFIC PLAN imposes specific mitigation measures and monitoring requirements on the project. Certain conditions of the SPECIFIC PLAN and this implementing project constitute reporting/monitoring requirements for certain mitigation measures."

30.PLANNING. 4 SP - NON-IMPLEMENTING MAPS RECOMMND

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

"A land division filed for the purposes of phasing or financing shall not be considered an implementing

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 4

SP - NON-IMPLEMENTING MAPS (cont.)

RECOMMND

development application for the purposes of the Planning Department's conditions of approval.

Should this project be an application for phasing or financing, all of the other conditions in this implementing project with a prefix of "SP" will be considered as NOT APPLICABLE, and this condition shall be considered as MET. Should this project not be an application for phasing or financing, this condition shall be considered as NOT APPLICABLE."

30.PLANNING. 5

SP - DURATION OF SP VALIDITY

RECOMMND

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

"The SPECIFIC PLAN that this project is a part of has a life span of twenty (20) years from the date of the approval by the Board of Supervisors of the SPECIFIC PLAN. Should the SPECIFIC PLAN not be substantially built out in that period of time, the project proponent shall file a specific plan amendment to be processed concurrently with this implementing proposal or the County may begin a revocation process (For the purposes of this condition, substantial buildout shall be defined as eighty percent (80%) of the maximum amount of dwelling units allowed by the SPECIFIC PLAN as most recently amended, the issuance of the 317th building permit.) The specific plan amendment will update the entire specific plan document to reflect current development requirements.

This condition shall be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if the implementing project has been filed within the above listed parameters, and shall be considered as MET if the specific plan amendment has been filed."

30.PLANNING. 7

SP - PROJECT LOCATION EXHIBIT

RECOMMND

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

"The applicant shall provide to the Planning Department an

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 7 SP - PROJECT LOCATION EXHIBIT (cont.) RECOMMND

8 1/2" x 11" exhibit showing where in the SPECIFIC PLAN this project is located. The exhibit shall also show all prior implementing projects within the SPECIFIC PLAN that have already been approved.]

This condition shall be considered MET once the applicant provides the Planning Department with the required information. This condition may not be DEFERRED."

30.PLANNING. 8 SP - ACOUSTICAL STUDY REQD RECOMMND

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

"PRIOR TO PROJECT APPROVAL, an acoustical study shall be submitted to the Planning Department and the Department of Environmental Health - Industrial Hygiene Division for review and approval.

This condition shall be considered MET if the relevant study has been approved by the Planning Department and the Department of Environmental Health-Industrial Hygiene Division. This condition may be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if the Planning Department determines that the required study is not necessary.

The submittal of this study mandates that a CEQA determination of an Addendum to a previously adopted EIR be made, at a minimum."

30.PLANNING. 10 SP - ARCHAEO STUDY REQD RECOMMND

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

"PRIOR TO PROJECT APPROVAL, a archaeological study shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval.

This condition shall be considered MET if the relevant study has been approved by the Planning Department. This condition may be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if the

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 10 SP - ARCHAEO STUDY REQD (cont.)

RECOMMND

Planning Department determines that the required study is not necessary.

The submittal of this study mandates that a CEQA determination of an Addendum to a previously adopted EIR be made, at a minimum."

30.PLANNING. 11 SP - BIOLOGICAL STUDY REQD

RECOMMND

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

"PRIOR TO PROJECT APPROVAL, a biological study shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval.

This condition shall be considered MET if the relevant study has been approved by the Planning Department. This condition may be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if the Planning Department determines that the required study is not necessary.

The submittal of this study mandates that a CEQA determination of an Addendum to a previously adopted EIR be made, at a minimum."

30.PLANNING. 12 SP *- ADDENDUM EIR

RECOMMND

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

"This implementing project has been reviewed in the context the EIR, which is associated with this SPECIFIC PLAN. The Planning Department has reviewed this project and its relationship to the EIR, and has found that no new environmental impacts have arisen since the certification of the EIR. Although the EIR adequately addressed the environmental impacts of the SPECIFIC PLAN as a whole, more detailed technical informaiton (i.e. traffic studies, updated biological studies, etc.) have been required by the Planning Department and/or other COUNTY land development review departments in order to complete its environmental

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 12 SP *- ADDENDUM EIR (cont.)

RECOMMND

review. Therefore, an ADDENDUM to the previously certified EIR has been prepared in conjunction with this implementing application.

This condition shall be considered MET if an ADDENDUM to the EIR has been prepared. Alternatively, this condition shall be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if an ADDENDUM to the EIR is not required."

30.PLANNING. 13 SP - EA REQUIRED

RECOMMND

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

"If this implementing project is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an environmental assessment shall be filed and processed concurrently with this implementing project. At a minimum, the environmental assessment shall utilize the evaluation of impacts addressed in the EIR prepared for the SPECIFIC PLAN.

This condition shall be considered as MET if an environmental assessment was conducted for this implementing project. This condition may be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if this implementing project is not subject to CEQA. This condition may not be DEFERRED."

30.PLANNING. 14 SP *- SUPPLEMENT TO EIR

RECOMMND

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

"This implementing project has been reviewed in the context the EIR, which is associated with this SPECIFIC PLAN. The Planning Department has reviewed this project and its relationship to the EIR, and has found that although the EIR adequately addressed the environmental impacts of the SPECIFIC PLAN at the time, new environmental impacts have arisen since the certification of the original EIR. The Planning Department has determined that the new environmental impacts can be mitigated to below a level of

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 14 SP *- SUPPLEMENT TO EIR (cont.)

RECOMMND

significance. Therefore, a SUPPLEMENT to the previously certified EIR has been prepared in conjunction with this implementing application.

This condition shall be considered MET if a SUPPLEMENT to the EIR has been prepared. Alternatively, this condition shall be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if a SUPPLEMENT to the EIR is not required."

30.PLANNING. 15 SP *- SUBSEQUENT EIR

RECOMMND

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

"This implementing project has been reviewed in the context the EIR, which is associated with this SPECIFIC PLAN. The Planning Department has reviewed this project and its relationship to the EIR, and has found that although the EIR adequately addressed the environmental impacts of the SPECIFIC PLAN at the time, new environmental impacts have arisen since the certification of the original EIR. The Planning Department has determined that this implementing project may have a significant impact to the new environmental impacts that have arisen. Therefore, a SUBSEQUENT EIR has been prepared in conjunction with this implementing application.

This condition shall be considered MET if a SUBSEQUENT EIR has been prepared. Alternatively, this condition shall be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if a SUBSEQUENT to the EIR is not required."

30.PLANNING. 17 SP - AMENDMENT REQUIRED

RECOMMND

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

"If this implementing project meets any of the following criteria, an amendment to the SPECIFIC PLAN shall be required and processed concurrently with this implementing project:

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 17 SP - AMENDMENT REQUIRED (cont.)

RECOMMND

1. The implementing project adds any area to, or deletes area from, the SPECIFIC PLAN;
2. The implementing project proposes a substantially different use than currently allowed in the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e. proposing a residential use within a commercially designated area); or
3. as determined by the Planning Director.

Any amendment to the SPECIFIC PLAN, even though it may affect only one portion of the SPECIFIC PLAN, shall be accompanied by a complete specific plan document which includes the entire specific plan, including both changed and unchanged parts.

This condition shall be considered MET if the specific plan amendment has been filed, and NOT APPLICABLE if a specific plan amendment is determined to be unnecessary."

30.PLANNING. 18 SP - PARK AGENCY REQUIRED

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing land division project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e. tract map, or parcel map), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION of any subdivision, or other residential development application, all portions of this implementing project not currently within the boundaries of a Recreation and Park District or County Service Area, shall be annexed into a Recreation and Park District, County Service Area or a similar entity such as a County Service Area/District that has been designated by the Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Section 10.35(G) of Ordinance No. 460, to receive park dedications and fees.

This Condition to include payment of Park fees to the City of Riverside as mitigation for impacts to the City's facilities. A clearance letter from the City of Riverside indication the fees have been paid is needed to clear this part of the condition.

Documentation of said annexation shall be provided to the Planning Department.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 18 SP - PARK AGENCY REQUIRED (cont.)

RECOMMND

This condition shall be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if the Recreation and Parks District or County Service Area is unwilling or unable to annex the property in question."

30.PLANNING. 19 SP - AG/DAIRY NOTIFICATION

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing residential land division within the SPECIFIC PLAN, the following condition of approval shall be applied to the implementing project stating that:

"PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION, the applicant shall submit a detailed proposal for the notification of all initial and future purchasers of dwelling units within the subject project of the existence of dairies and/or other agricultural uses within one half mile of the property and potential impacts resulting from those uses. Said notification shall be in addition to any notice required by Ordinance No. 625 (Riverside County Right-to-Farm Ordinance). Said approved notification shall be provided to all initial and all future purchasers of dwelling units within the subject project."

30.PLANNING. 20 SP - PA PROCEDURES

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map or parcel map), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION in the case of land division applications (tentative parcel maps or tentative tract maps) or PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMITS in the case of use permit applications (plot plans, conditional use permits, or public use permits):

"The planning area[s] for which this land division application is located must be legally defined. Any of the following procedures may be used in order to legally define planning area[s]:

1. The project proponent has processed a FINAL CHANGE OF ZONE MAP concurrent with the SPECIFIC PLAN which legally defined planning area[s].
2. The project proponent shall file a change of zone application along with a legal description defining the boundaries of the planning area affected by this land division application. The applicant will not be

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 20 SP - PA PROCEDURES (cont.)

RECOMMND

changing the allowed uses or standards within the existing zone but will merely be providing an accurate legal description of the affected planning area. The change of zone shall be approved and adopted by the Board of Supervisors."

30.PLANNING. 21 SP -COMMON AREA MAINTENANCE

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing land division project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e. tract map or parcel map), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing application:

"PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION, the following procedures for common area maintenance procedures shall be complied with:

a. A permanent master maintenance organization shall be established for the specific plan area, to assume ownership and maintenance responsibility for all common recreation, open space, circulation systems and landscaped areas. The organization may be public or private. Merger with an area-wide or regional organization shall satisfy this condition provided that such organization is legally and financially capable of assuming the responsibilities for ownership and maintenance. If the organization is a private association then neighborhood associations shall be established for each residential development, where required, and such associations may assume ownership and maintenance responsibility for neighborhood common areas.

b. Unless otherwise provided for in these conditions of approval, common open areas shall be conveyed to the maintenance organization as implementing development is approved or any subdivision as recorded.

c. The maintenance organization shall be established prior to or concurrent with the recordation of the first land division.

d. The common areas to be maintained by the master maintenance organization shall include, but not be limited to, any improved open space areas that are not maintained by the CSA, Transportation, Flood Control or Regional Parks.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 22

SP - CC&R RES PUB COMMON AREA

RECOMMND

rior to the approval of any implementing land division project (i.e. tract map or parcel map), the following condition shall be applied to the land division PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION if the permanent master maintenance organization referenced in the condition entitled "SP - Common Area Maintenance" is a public organization:

"The applicant shall convey to the County fee simple title, to all common open space areas, free and clear of all liens, taxes, assessments, leases (recorded or unrecorded) and easement, except those easements which in the sole discretion of the County are acceptable. As a condition precedent to the County accepting title to such areas, the applicant shall notify the Planning Department that the following documents shall be submitted to the Office of the County Counsel and submit said documents for review along with the current fee, which shall be subject to County Counsel approval:

1. A cover letter identifying the project for which approval is sought;
2. A signed and notarized declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions;
3. A sample document, conveying title to the purchaser, of an individual lot or unit which provides that the declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions is incorporated therein by reference; and,
4. A deposit equaling three (3) hours of the current hourly fee for Review of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions established pursuant to County Ordinance No. 671 at the time the above referenced documents are submitted for County Counsel review.

The declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions submitted for review shall a) provide for a minimum term of 60 years, b) provide for the establishment of a property owners' association comprised of the owners of each individual lot or unit as tenants in common, and c) contain the following provisions verbatim:

"Notwithstanding any provision in this Declaration to the contrary, the following provisions shall apply:

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 22 SP - CC&R RES PUB COMMON AREA (cont.)

RECOMMND

The property owners' association established herein shall, if dormant, be activated, by incorporation or otherwise, at the request of the County of Riverside, and the property owners' association shall unconditionally accept from the County of Riverside, upon the County's demand, title to all or any part of the 'common area', more particularly described on Exhibit '___' attached hereto. Such acceptance shall be through the president of the property owner's association, who shall be authorized to execute any documents required to facilitate transfer of the 'common area'. The decision to require activation of the property owners' association and the decision to require that the association unconditionally accept title to the 'common area' shall be at the sole discretion of the County of Riverside.

In the event that the 'common area', or any part thereof, is conveyed to the property owners' association, the association, thereafter, shall own such 'common area', shall manage and continuously maintain such 'common area', and shall not sell or transfer such 'common area' or any part thereof, absent the prior written consent of the Planning Director of the County of Riverside or the County's successor-in-interest. The property owners' association shall have the right to assess the owner of each individual lot or unit for the reasonable cost of maintaining such 'common area', and shall have the right to lien the property of any such owner who defaults in the payment of a maintenance assessment. An assessment lien, once created, shall be prior to all other liens recorded subsequent to the notice of assessment or other document creating the assessment lien.

This declaration shall not be terminated, 'substantially' amended, or property deannexed therefrom absent the prior written consent of the Planning Director of the County of Riverside or the County's successor-in-interest. A proposed amendment shall be considered 'substantial' if it affects the extent, usage or maintenance of the 'common area' established pursuant to this Declaration.

In the event of any conflict between this Declaration and the Articles of Incorporation, the Bylaws, or the property owners' association Rules and Regulations, if any, this Declaration shall control."

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 22 SP - CC&R RES PUB COMMON AREA (cont.) (cont.)RECOMMND

Once approved by the Office of County Counsel, the declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions shall be recorded by the Planning Department with one copy retained for the case file, and one copy provided to the County Transportation Department - Survey Division."

30.PLANNING. 23 SP - CC&R RES PRI COMMON AREA RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing land division project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (tract map or parcel map), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION if the permanent master maintenance organization referenced in the condition entitled "SP - Common Area Maintenance" is a private organization:

"The applicant shall notify the Planning Department that the following documents shall be submitted to the Office of County Counsel and submit said documents for review along with the current fee, which shall be subject to County Counsel approval:

1. A cover letter identifying the project for which approval is sought;

2. A signed and notarized declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions;

3. A sample document, conveying title to the purchaser of an individual lot or unit, which provides that the declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions is incorporated therein by reference; and,

4. A deposit equaling three (3) hours of the current hourly fee for Review if Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions established pursuant to County Ordinance No. 671 at the time the above referenced documents are submitted for County Counsel review.

The declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions submitted for review shall a) provide for a minimum term of 60 years, b) provide for the establishment of a property owners' association comprised of the owners of each individual lot or unit as tenants in common, c) provide for ownership of the common area by either the property owners'

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 23

SP - CC&R RES PRI COMMON AREA (cont.)

RECOMMND

association or the owners of each individual lot or unit as tenants in common, and (d) contain the following provisions verbatim:

"Notwithstanding, any provision in this Declaration to the contrary, the following provisions shall apply:

The property owners' association established herein shall manage and continuously maintain the 'common area', more particularly described on Exhibit '___', attached hereto, and shall not sell or transfer the 'common area' or any part thereof, absent the prior written consent of the Planning Director of the County of Riverside or the County's successor-in-interest.

The property owners' association shall have the right to assess the owners of each individual lot or unit for the reasonable cost of maintaining such 'common area' and shall have the right to lien the property of any such owner who defaults in the payment of a maintenance assessment. An assessment lien, once created, shall be prior to all other liens recorded subsequent to the notice of assessment or other document creating the assessment lien.

This Declaration shall not be terminated, 'substantially' amended, or property deannexed therefrom absent the prior written consent of the Planning Director of the County of Riverside or the County's successor-in-interest. A proposed amendment shall be considered 'substantial' if it affects the extent, usage or maintenance of the 'common area' established pursuant to this Declaration.

In the event of any conflict between this Declaration and the Articles of Incorporation, the Bylaws, or the property owners' association Rules and Regulations, if any, this Declaration shall control."

Once approved by the Office of County Counsel, the declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions shall be recorded the Planning Department with one copy retained for the case file, and one copy provided to the County Transportation Department - Survey Division."

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 26

SP - GENERIC M/M PROGRAM

RECOMMND

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

"PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS, the project applicant shall provide to the Planning Department a detailed proposal for complying with the preliminary mitigation and monitoring procedures described in the EIR. Grading permits will not be issued unless the preliminary mitigation and monitoring procedures as described in the EIR are substantially complied with."

30.PLANNING. 27

SP - F&G CLEARANCE

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e. tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.) which may propose grading or construction within or along the banks of any blue-lined stream, the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS, the applicant shall obtain written notification to the County Planning Department that the appropriate California Department of Fish and Game notification pursuant to Sections 1601/1603 of the California Fish and Game Code has taken place, or obtain an "Agreement Regarding Proposed Stream or Lake Alteration" (Sections 1601/1603 Permit) should any grading or construction be proposed within or along the banks of any natural watercourse or wetland, located either on-site or any required off-site improvement areas. Copies of any agreement shall be submitted with the notification."

30.PLANNING. 28

SP - ACOE CLEARANCE

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e. tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.) which may propose grading or construction within or along the banks of any blue-lined stream which is determined to be within the jurisdiction of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS, the applicant shall obtain written notification to the County Planning

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 28 SP - ACOE CLEARANCE (cont.)

RECOMMND

Department that the alteration of any watercourse or wetland, located either on-site or on any required off-site improvement areas, complies with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permit Conditions, or obtain a permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act should any grading or construction be proposed within or along the banks of any natural watercourse or wetland. Copies of any agreement shall be submitted with the notification."

30.PLANNING. 29 SP - SKR FEE CONDITION

RECOMMND

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

"PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 663, which generally requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance. The amount of the fee required to be paid may vary depending upon a variety of factors, including type of development application submitted and the applicability of any fee reduction or exemption provisions contained in Riverside County Ordinance No. 663. Said fee shall be calculated on the approved development project which is anticipated to be 333.7 acres in accordance with the SPECIFIC PLAN. If the development is subsequently revised, this acreage amount may be modified in order to reflect the revised development project acreage amount. In the event Riverside County Ordinance No. 663 is rescinded, this condition will no longer be applicable. However, should Riverside County Ordinance No. 663 be rescinded and superseded by a subsequent mitigation fee ordinance, payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance shall be required."

30.PLANNING. 30 SP - ENTRY MONUMENTATION

RECOMMND

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

"PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS, the following language shall be added to the landscaping requirements of

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 30 SP - ENTRY MONUMENTATION (cont.) RECOMMND

the implementing project:

1. An entry monument shall be shown on the Exhibit L.
2. The entry monument shall be in substantial conformance to the SPECIFIC PLAN design guidelines.

30.PLANNING. 31 SP - POST GRADING REPORT RECOMMND

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

"PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS, the project applicant shall provide to the Planning Department a post grading report. The report shall describe how the mitigation and monitoring program as described in the EIR and and required pre-grading agreements with the qualified archaeologist/paleontologist were complied with."

30.PLANNING. 32 SP - SCHOOL MITIGATION RECOMMND

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

"PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMITS, impacts to the Riverside Unified School District shall be mitigated in accordance with state law."

30.PLANNING. 33 SP - GEO STUDY REQUIRED RECOMMND

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

"PRIOR TO PROJECT APPROVAL, a [geological/geotechnical] study shall be submitted to the Planning Department Engineering Geologist for review and approval.

This condition shall be considered MET if the relevant study has been approved by the Planning Department. This condition may be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if the Planning Department determines that the required study is

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 33 SP - GEO STUDY REQUIRED (cont.) RECOMMND

not necessary.

The submittal of this study mandates that a CEQA determination of an Addendum to a previously adopted EIR be made, at a minimum."

30.PLANNING. 35 SP - IF HUMAN REMAINS FOUND RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any land division or development permit (use permit, plot plan, etc.), a condition of approval shall be applied to the land division or development permit, and shall read as follows:

If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resource Code section 5097.98. The County Coroner shall be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify the appropriate NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBE who is the most likely descendent. The descendent shall inspect the site of the discovery and make a recommendation as to the appropriate mitigation. After the recommendations have been made, the land divider, a Native American Tribe representative, and a County representative shall meet to determine the appropriate mitigation measures and corrective actions to be implemented.

30.PLANNING. 36 SP - PA1 PARKS PLANS RECOMMND

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

Prior to the issuance of the 22nd Building Permit in Planning Area 1 the detailed park plans for parks in Planning Areas 4, 5 and 7 shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Department other entity set forth in the Planning Department's condition entitled "SP - Common Area Maintenance" for the park site designated as the Planning Areas 4, 5, and 7. The detailed park plans shall substantially conform with the design criteria in the SPECIFIC PLAN, Ordinance No. 859 (as adopted and any

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 36 SP - PA1 PARKS PLANS (cont.) RECOMMND

amendments thereto), and the Riverside County Guide to California Friendly Landscaping. The park plans need not be working drawings, but shall include landscape and irrigation plans, descriptions and placement of recreational facilities and documentation evidencing a permanent maintenance mechanism for the park and its facilities.

30.PLANNING. 37 SP - PA2 PARKS PLANS RECOMMND

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

Prior to the issuance of the 31nd Building Permit in Planning Area 2 the detailed park plans for parks in Planning Areas 6 and 9 shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Department other entity set forth in the Planning Department's condition entitled "SP - Common Area Maintenance" for the park site designated as the Planning Areas 6, and 9. The detailed park plans shall substantially conform with the design criteria in the SPECIFIC PLAN, Ordinance No. 859 (as adopted and any amendments thereto), and the Riverside County Guide to California Friendly Landscaping. The park plans need not be working drawings, but shall include landscape and irrigation plans, descriptions and placement of recreational facilities and documentation evidencing a permanent maintenance mechanism for the park and its facilities.

30.PLANNING. 38 SP - PA3 PARKS PLANS RECOMMND

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

Prior to the issuance of the 21nd Building Permit in Planning Area 3 the detailed park plans for parks in Planning Areas 8, 10 and 11 shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Department other entity set forth in the Planning Department's condition entitled "SP - Common Area Maintenance" for the park site designated as the Planning Areas 8, 10, and 11. The detailed park plans

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 38 SP - PA3 PARKS PLANS (cont.) RECOMMND

shall substantially conform with the design criteria in the SPECIFIC PLAN, Ordinance No. 859 (as adopted and any amendments thereto), and the Riverside County Guide to California Friendly Landscaping. The park plans need not be working drawings, but shall include landscape and irrigation plans, descriptions and placement of recreational facilities and documentation evidencing a permanent maintenance mechanism for the park and its facilities.

30.PLANNING. 39 SP - PA4 PARK CONST REQ RECOMMND

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

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE 44th building permit within Planning Area No. 1 of the SPECIFIC PLAN, the park designated as Planning Area 4 shall be constructed and fully operable.

30.PLANNING. 40 SP - PA5 PARK CONST REQ RECOMMND

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

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE 66th building permit within Planning Area No. 1 of the SPECIFIC PLAN, the park designated as Planning Area 5 shall be constructed and fully operable.

30.PLANNING. 41 SP - PA7 PARK CONST REQ RECOMMND

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

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE 88th building permit within Planning Area No. 1 of the SPECIFIC PLAN, the park designated as Planning Area 7 shall be constructed and fully operable.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 42 SP - PA6 PARK CONST REQ RECOMMND

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

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE 62nd building permit within Planning Area No. 2 of the SPECIFIC PLAN, the park designated as Planning Area 6 shall be constructed and fully operable.

30.PLANNING. 43 SP - PA9 PARK CONST REQ RECOMMND

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

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE 93rd building permit within Planning Area No. 2 of the SPECIFIC PLAN, the park designated as Planning Area 9 shall be constructed and fully operable.

30.PLANNING. 44 SP - PA8 PARK CONST REQ RECOMMND

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

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE 42nd building permit within Planning Area No. 3 of the SPECIFIC PLAN, the park designated as Planning Area 8 shall be constructed and fully operable.

30.PLANNING. 45 SP - PA10 PARK CONST REQ RECOMMND

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

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE 63rd building permit within Planning Area No. 3 of the SPECIFIC PLAN, the park designated as Planning Area 10 shall be constructed and fully operable.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 46

SP - PA11 PARK CONST REQ

RECOMMND

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

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE 84th building permit within Planning Area No. 3 of the SPECIFIC PLAN, the park designated as Planning Area 11 shall be constructed and fully operable.

30.PLANNING. 47

SP-ARCHAEO M/M PROGRAM

RECOMMND

PRIOR TO THE SCHEDULING FOR A PUBLIC HEARING/APPROVAL/ACTION/ OF ANY IMPLEMENTING PROJECT WITHIN THE SPECIFIC PLAN (I.E.: INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO: TRACT MAP, PARCEL MAP, USE PERMIT, PLOT PLAN, ETC.), THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS SHALL BE PLACED ON THE IMPLEMENTING PROEJECT:

10. Planning. General Conditions
INFORMATIONAL:

County Archaeological Report (PDA) No. 04809, submitted for this project (TR36390, SP00325A1) was prepared by Brian F. Smith by Brian F. Smith and Associates and is entitled: "A Phase I and Phase II Cultural Resource Study for the Citrus Heights/Fairway Drive Project" dated July 23, 2013. This report, which is a combined report including all the previous studies completed for the project, (PDAs 4801, 4802, 4800, 4787), has been incorporated as part of the project.

During the Phase I survey of the property in 2001, the consultant evaluated nine archaeological sites, all prehistoric (CA-RIV-326, -2568, -2569, 2570, -3082, -3851, -3853, -6650, -6651) within the project area. During March of 2013 a survey of the proposed alignment for Street "A" (referred to as Fairway Drive) and associated with the Citrus Heights Project, was conducted resulting in the identification testing and evaluation of two historic period sites (CA-RIV-11,302 and -11,303 and the identification of one prehistoric isolate (P-33-021732). This results in a total of eleven archaeological sites in the project area. Five of the eleven sites can be avoided (CA-RIV-3082, -3853, -6650, -6651, and 11,302). However, six of the eleven sites will be impacted (CA-RIV-326, -2568, -2569, -2570, -3851, and -11,303) as well as one

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 47 SP-ARCHAEO M/M PROGRAM (cont.)

RECOMMND

prehistoric isolate (P-33-021732).

The report concludes that none of the sites are significant per CEQA criteria. Additionally, the isolate is a non-significant cultural resource. Hence, based on this information, it has been determined that there is no significant effect on the environment pertaining to cultural resources. No site-specific mitigation measures are required, however a mitigation and monitoring program will be required for the project for which an Archaeologist and Native American Monitor will monitor grading activities in the project area.

This condition shall not modify any approved condition of approval or mitigation measure.

60. Planning. Archaeological Monitor Required

The applicant/developer shall retain and enter into a monitoring and mitigation service contract with a County approved Archaeologist for professional services relative to review of grading plans, preparation of a monitoring plan for all areas of disturbance that may impact previously undisturbed deposits (if any), and monitoring of site grading for areas of previously undisturbed deposits. The Archaeologist is required to attend a pre-grade meeting and is required to conduct a cultural/historical sensitivity training for the construction staff at this meeting.

The applicant/developer shall submit a fully executed copy of the contract for archaeological monitoring and mitigation services to the County Archaeologist to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Planning Department shall clear this condition.

This condition shall not modify any approved condition of approval or mitigation measure.

Note: The project Archaeologist is responsible for implementing CEQA-based mitigation using standard professional practices for cultural resources archaeology. The project Archaeologist shall coordinate with the County, applicant/developer and any required tribal or other special interest group monitor throughout the process as appropriate. All documentation regarding the arrangements

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 47

SP-ARCHAEO M/M PROGRAM (cont.) (cont.)

RECOMMND

for the disposition and curation and/or repatriation of cultural resources shall be provided to the County for review and approval prior to issuance of the grading permit.

The archaeologist shall also be responsible for preparing the Phase IV monitoring report.

This condition shall not modify any approved condition of approval or mitigation measure.

60. Planning. Native American Monitor Required

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A GRADING PERMIT:

The developer/permit applicant shall enter into a contract and retain a Native American monitor(s) designated by the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians. Although not required as part of this condition of approval, the County encourages the participation of a Native American monitor at the pre-grade meeting. The contract shall address the treatment and ultimate disposition of cultural resources which may include repatriation and/or curation in a Riverside County approved curation facility.

The Native American Monitor shall have the limited authority to temporarily divert, redirect or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and potential recovery of cultural resources in coordination with the appropriate Cultural Resources Professional such as an Archaeologist, and/or Historic Archaeologist, Architectural Historian and/or Historian.

The developer/permit applicant shall submit a fully executed copy of the contract to the County Archaeologist to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Archaeologist shall clear this condition.

NOTE:

1)The Cultural Resources Professional is responsible for implementing mitigation and standard professional practices for cultural resources. The Professional shall coordinate with the County, developer/permit applicant and Native American Monitors throughout the process.

2)Special interest monitoring does not replace any required Cultural Resources monitoring, but rather serves as a supplement for coordination and advisory purposes for all groups' interests only.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30. PLANNING. 47 SP-ARCHAEO M/M PROGRAM (cont.) (cont.) (cont.RECOMMND

3) The developer/permit applicant shall not be required to further pursue any agreement for special interest monitoring of this project if after 60 days from the initial attempt to secure an agreement the developer/permit applicant, through demonstrable good faith effort, has been unable to secure said agreement from the Native American Monitors. A good faith effort shall consist of no less than 3 written attempts from the developer/permit applicant to the tribe to secure the required special interest monitoring agreement and appropriate e-mail and telephone contact attempts. Documentation of the effort made to secure the agreement shall be submitted to the County Archaeologist for review and consideration.

4) Should repatriation be preferred, it shall not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been submitted to the Riverside County Archaeologist. Should curation be preferred, the developer/permit applicant is responsible for all costs.

This agreement shall not modify any condition of approval or mitigation measure.

60. Planning. Five Archaeo sites to be avoided by construction

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A GRADING PERMIT:

Due to a coordinated effort/series of communications between the County, the applicant, the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians, and the archaeological consultant, it has been determined that four prehistoric sites CA-RIV-3082, -6650, -3853, and -6651 and one historic-period archaeological site (CA-RIV-11,302) are to be located in open space conservation easement areas and can, hence, be avoided from being directly impacted by project grading. The sites shall be protected by orange fencing and signage and monitors on-site will ensure the sites are avoided and maintain fencing integrity.

70. Planning. Phase IV Monitoring Report

PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT FINAL (ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING/PHASE IV REPORT SUBMITTAL):

The developer/holder shall prompt the Project Cultural Resources Professional to submit one (1) wet-signed paper copy and (1) CD of a Phase IV Cultural Resources Monitoring Report that complies with the Riverside County Planning Department's requirements for such reports for all ground disturbing activities associated with this grading permit.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 47 SP-ARCHAEO M/M PROGRAM (cont.) (cont.) (cont.RECOMMND

The report shall follow the County of Riverside Planning Department Cultural Resources (Archaeological) Investigations Standard Scopes of Work posted on the TLMA website. The report shall also include evidence of the required cultural/historical sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grade meeting. The County Archaeologist shall review the report to determine adequate mitigation compliance was met. Upon determining the report and mitigation is adequate, the County Archaeologist shall clear this condition.

This condition shall not modify any approved condition of approval or mitigation measure.

TRANS DEPARTMENT

30.TRANS. 1 SP - SP325A1/INSTALLATION RECOMMND

The project proponent shall be responsible for the design of traffic signal(s) at the intersections of:

Signals not eligible for fee credit:

- La Sierra Avenue (NS) at Indiana Avenue (EW) (signal modification for added lane)
- La Sierra Avenue (NS) at Victoria Avenue (EW) (signal modification for added lane)
- La Sierra Avenue (NS) at El Sobrante Road (EW)
- Van Buren Boulevard (NS) at Victoria Avenue (EW) (signal modification for added lane)
- Van Buren Boulevard (NS) at Fairway Drive (EW)

or as approved by the Transportation Department.

For improvements eligible for fee credit, the project proponent shall contact the Transportation Department and enter into an agreement for signal mitigation fee credit or reimbursement prior to start of construction of the signal.

All work shall be pre-approved by and shall comply with the requirements of the Transportation Department and the public contract code in order to be eligible for fee credit or reimbursement.

30.TRANS. 2 SP - SP325A1/GEOMETRICS RECOMMND

The intersection of La Sierra Avenue (NS) at Indiana Avenue (EW) shall be improved to provide the following geometrics:

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.TRANS. 2

SP - SP325A1/GEOMETRICS (cont.)

RECOMMND

Northbound: two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, one right-turn lane

Southbound: two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, one right-turn lane

Eastbound: two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, one right-turn lane

Westbound: two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, one right-turn lane with overlap

NOTE: The project shall remove the north leg crosswalk to allow for additional green time to other movements.

The intersection of La Sierra Avenue (NS) at Victoria Avenue (EW) shall be improved to provide the following geometrics:

Northbound: one left-turn lane, one through lane, one share through/right-turn lane

Southbound: one left-turn lane, one through lane, one share through/right-turn lane

Eastbound: two left-turn lanes, one through lane, one right-turn lane

Westbound: two left-turn lanes, one through lane, one right-turn lane

The intersection of La Sierra Avenue (NS) at El Sobrante Road (EW) shall be signalized and improved to provide the following geometrics:

Northbound: two through lanes

Southbound: one left-turn lane, one through lane

Eastbound: N/A

Westbound: one left-turn lane, one right-turn lane

NOTE: The installation of a traffic signal at this location shall include a CCTV monitoring system for El Sobrante Road and traffic signal interconnect along La Sierra Avenue to McAllister Parkway.

The intersection of McAllister Street (NS) at Fairway Drive (EW) shall be improved to provide the following geometrics:

Northbound: one through lane

Southbound: one through lane

Eastbound: N/A

Westbound: one through lane - stop controlled

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.TRANS. 2

SP - SP325A1/GEOMETRICS (cont.) (cont.)

RECOMMND

The intersection of Driveway 1 (NS) at Fairway Drive (EW) shall be improved to provide the following geometrics:

Northbound: one through lane - stop controlled
Southbound: N/A
Eastbound: one through lane
Westbound: one through lane

The intersection of Driveway 2 (NS) at Fairway Drive (EW) shall be improved to provide the following geometrics:

Northbound: one through lane - stop controlled
Southbound: N/A
Eastbound: one through lane
Westbound: one through lane

The intersection of Van Buren Boulevard (NS) at Victoria Avenue (EW) shall be improved to provide the following geometrics:

Northbound: one left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane
Southbound: one left-turn lane, three through lanes, one right-turn lane
Eastbound: one left-turn lane, one through lane, one right-turn lane with overlap
Westbound: one left-turn lane, one through lane, one right-turn lane

The intersection of Van Buren Boulevard (NS) at Fairway Drive (EW) shall be signalized and improved to provide the following geometrics:

Northbound: one left-turn lane, two through lanes
Southbound: two through lanes, one right-turn lane
Eastbound: one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane
Westbound: N/A

or as approved by the Transportation Department.

All improvements listed are requirements for interim conditions only. Full right-of-way and roadway half sections adjacent to the property for the ultimate roadway cross-section per the County's Road Improvement Standards and Specifications must be provided.

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.TRANS. 2 SP - SP325A1/GEOMETRICS (cont.) (cont.) (cont)RECOMMND

Any off-site widening required to provide these geometrics shall be the responsibility of the landowner/developer.

30.TRANS. 3 SP - SP325A1/CREDIT/REIMBURSE RECOMMND

In order to receive any fee credit or reimbursement for improvements, the project proponent shall contact the Transportation Department and enter into an agreement for fee credit or reimbursement prior to advertising. All work shall be preapproved by and shall comply with the requirements of the Transportation Department and the public contracts code in order to be eligible for fee credit or reimbursement.

To enter into an agreement, please contact our Funding Programs group at (951) 955-1667.

For more information regarding the public work bidding requirements please visit the following link:
http://www.rctlma.org/trans/rbbd_contractbidding.html.

30.TRANS. 4 SP - SP325A1/AGRMNT WITH CITY RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall use all reasonable efforts to enter into an agreement with the City of Riverside to pay standard traffic impacts fees to intersections with the City limits which are impacted by the project. The project proponent shall pay the standard traffic impacts fees in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time of building permit issuance.

30.TRANS. 5 SP - SP325A1/INTERCONNECT RECOMMND

The project proponent shall be required to provide traffic signal interconnect between the traffic signal at La Sierra Avenue (NS) at El Sobrante Road (EW) to the signal at La Sierra Avenue Street (NS) and Blackburn Road (EW).

or as approved by the Transportation Department.

30.TRANS. 6 SP - SP325A1/IMPROVEMENTS RECOMMND

All roads shall be improved per the recommended General Plan or Specific Plan designations, as approved by the County Board of Supervisors, or as approved by the

08/21/13
08:34

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 52

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00325A1

Parcel: 269-100-014

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.TRANS. 6

SP - SP325A1/IMPROVEMENTS (cont.)

RECOMMND

Transportation Department.

TRACT MAP Tract #: TR36390

Parcel: 269-100-014

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

EVERY DEPARTMENT

10. EVERY. 1 MAP - PROJECT DESCRIPTION RECOMMND

The land division hereby permitted a Schedule A subdivision that would subdivide 333.7 acre property into a 343 single-family residential lots, 8 park lots, 3 water quality detention basin lots, and 43 open space lots (394 total)

10. EVERY. 2 MAP - HOLD HARMLESS RECOMMND

The applicant/permittee or any successor-in-interest shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County of Riverside or its agents, officers, and employees (COUNTY) from the following:

(a) any claim, action, or proceeding against the COUNTY to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the COUNTY, its advisory agencies, appeal boards, or legislative body concerning the TENTATIVE MAP, which action is brought within the time period provided for in California Government Code, Section 66499.37; and,

(b) any claim, action or proceeding against the COUNTY to attack, set aside, void or annul any other decision made by the COUNTY concerning the TENTATIVE MAP, including, but not limited to, decisions made in response to California Public Records Act requests.

The COUNTY shall promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense. If the COUNTY fails to promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding or fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant/permittee shall not, thereafter, be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the COUNTY.

The obligations imposed by this condition include, but are not limited to, the following: the applicant/permittee shall pay all legal services expenses the COUNTY incurs in connection with any such claim, action or proceeding, whether it incurs such expenses directly, whether it is ordered by a court to pay such expenses, or whether it incurs such expenses by providing legal services through its Office of County Counsel.