
2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

2.1 PROJECT SETTING

2.1.1 Project Location

Figure 2-1, *Regional Map*, and Figure 2-2, *Vicinity Map*, depict the location of the Project site. The Project site is located within the El Sobrante community within the LMWAP of unincorporated Riverside County. Specifically, the Project site is located approximately 0.5-mile north of El Sobrante Road, 0.4-mile east of McAllister Street, and approximately 0.5-mile west of Vista del Lago Drive. The Project site is located within the Sphere of Influence of the City of Riverside. The subject property encompasses Assessor's Parcel Numbers 270-070-004, 270-080-017, 270-090-001, 270-090-002, and is located within Sections 32 and 33, Township 3 South, Range 5 West, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian.

2.1.2 Surrounding Land Uses and Development

Figure 2-3, *Surrounding Land Uses and Development*, depicts the existing land uses immediately surrounding the Project site. As shown, existing surrounding land uses include undeveloped land to the north, west, and south (the property to the north is approved for development as a master-planned residential community with 343 homes, marketing name "Citrus Heights"). Further west (east of McAllister Street) and south (north of El Sobrante Road) are small-scale agricultural operations and nurseries. Low density residential land uses are located to the northeast of the Project site, and scattered rural residences are located east of the Project site. Lake Matthews is located approximately 1.25-mile south of the Project site.

2.2 EXISTING SITE AND AREA CHARACTERISTICS

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15125, the physical environmental condition for purposes of establishing the setting of an MND is the environment as it existed at the time the Lead Agency commenced the environmental analysis for the project. The environmental analysis for the Project commenced in December 2013. As such, the environmental baseline for the Project is established as December 2013 and the following subsections provide a description of the Project site's physical environmental condition as of that approximate date. Topics are presented in no particular order of importance.

2.2.1 Land Use

From approximately 1967 to 2003, the Project site was an active citrus orchard. In 2003, the site transitioned to dryland agricultural activities until 2005, when the agricultural activities on the subject property ceased. The Project site is located within the El Sobrante No. 1 Agricultural Preserve, but is not subject to an active Williamson Act Contract. Figure 2-4, *Aerial Photograph*, depicts the existing conditions of the Project site. As shown, the site is currently vacant and undeveloped. The entire property is subjected to frequent, unauthorized off-road vehicle use, which has formed dirt access roads, motorcycle and bicycle trails, and tire ruts across the entire site. The only structure on the Project site is an abandoned storage barn located near the site's eastern boundary.





Figure 2-1

REGIONAL MAP





Source(s) - ESRI, RCTLMA (2014)




Figure 2-2

VICINITY MAP




Figure 2-3

SURROUNDING LAND USES AND DEVELOPMENT



Figure 2-4

AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH



2.2.2 Site Access

No paved access roads abut the Project site. Access to the Project site is provided via unimproved dirt roads that connect to Vista Del Lago Drive (approximately 0.5-mile to the east of the subject property). The Project site is located approximately 2.8 miles southeast of State Route 91 (SR-91), which is an east-west oriented facility operated by the California Department of Transportation (CalTrans). SR-91 provides a connection between Interstate 215 (I-215) to the east and Interstate 15 (I-15) to the west.

2.2.3 Utilities and Service Systems

The Project site is located within the service area of the Western Municipal Water District (WMWD) for domestic water and sewer service. Under existing conditions, no domestic water or sewer connections are provided to the Project site.


2.2.4 Aesthetics and Topographic Features

The majority of the site is characterized by undulating terrain, with some hillside and canyon topography, and generally slopes from east to west (see Figure 2-5, *USGS Topographic Map*). The topographic high point on the property occurs in the north-central portion of the site, at approximately 1,445 feet above mean sea level (amsl). The topographic low point occurs along the northwestern property boundary at 1,160 feet amsl. Overall topographic relief across the Project site is approximately 285 feet.

2.2.5 Geology

Regionally, the Project site is located in the Peninsular Ranges geomorphic province, a prominent natural geomorphic province that extends from the Santa Monica Mountains approximately 900 miles south to the tip of Baja California, Mexico, and is bounded to the east by the Colorado Desert. The Peninsular Ranges province is composed of plutonic and metamorphic rock, lesser amounts of Tertiary Volcanic and sedimentary rock, and Quaternary drainage in-fills and sedimentary veneers. The Project site is located within the Riverside sub-block, which is bounded by the Elsinore fault zone on the west and the San Jacinto fault zone on the east. (Alta, 2013, p. 7)

There are no known active or potentially active earthquake faults on the Project site or in the immediate area, and the Project site is not located within an "Alquist-Priolo" Special Studies Zone. Regional faults occurring near the Project site include the Elsinore Fault Zone, located approximately 7.8-miles to the southwest; the Chino Hills fault zone, located approximately 8.9-miles to the northwest; the San Jacinto fault zone, located approximately 14.7-miles to the northeast; and the San Andreas fault zone, located approximately 22.5-miles to the northeast. (Alta, 2013, p. 10) Similar to other properties throughout Southern California, the Project site is located within a seismically active region and is subject to ground shaking during seismic events. Groundwater was not encountered during subsurface investigations conducted on the Project site in 2012 (Alta, 2013, p. 11).



Source(s): USGS

Copyright © 2013 National Geographic Society, i-cubed




Figure 2-5

USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAP

2.2.6 Soils

The Project site features a thin veneer of undocumented fill at its surface and is underlain by “Alluvium and Colluvium,” “Older Alluvium,” and “Granodiorite and gabbro, undifferentiated” soils. The undocumented fill consists of mixtures of silty sands in a loose to medium dense, dry to damp condition. “Alluvium and Colluvium” consists of orange tan fine grained sandy silts, silt, and silty sand in a dry to damp, soft/loose and porous condition with roots, a few small gravel and many krotovinas. “Older Alluvium” consists of primarily reddish yellow to yellowish brown silty sand and clayey sand that is slightly moist and medium dense. “Granodiorite and gabbro, undifferentiated” is a bedrock material that consists of fine- to coarse-grained sand with some silt with colors ranging from orange tan (in the near surface) to various shades of gray (with depth) and in a dry and dense condition. (Alta, 2013, pp. 8-9)

2.2.7 Hydrology

The Project site is located in the Santa Ana River watershed, which drains an approximately 2,650 square-mile area and is the principal surface flow water body within the region. The Santa Ana River starts in the San Bernardino Mountains, approximately 36 miles northeast of the Project site, and flows southwesterly for approximately 96 miles across San Bernardino, Riverside, Los Angeles, and Orange counties before spilling into the Pacific Ocean.

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 06065C1385G (dated August 28, 2008), the entire Project site is located within “Flood Zone X (unshaded),” which corresponds with areas of minimal flood hazard (less than 0.2-percent annual chance of flood). (FEMA, 2008)

The general trend of the natural drainage on the Project site is from the southeast towards the northwest. The site’s southwestern boundary contains a natural canyon/drainage that collects the majority of the Project site’s runoff. Two (2) drainage corridors extend eastwards from the southwestern boundary into the site’s interior. Under existing conditions, the Project site accepts storm water runoff from an off-site tributary area located to the east (approximately 78.8 acres in size). Storm water runoff is conveyed across the site as sheet flow from southeast to northwest to one of the natural canyon/drainage courses that are located along the subject property’s northern, western, and southern boundaries. These drainage courses convey storm water away from the Project site and to the north, toward Harrison Dam.


2.2.8 Vegetation

Most of the Project site was used for agriculture over a period of approximately 40 years, from approximately 1967 to 2005. Since agriculture activities ceased, the property has been subject to routine maintenance (i.e., discing for fire fuel management). Therefore, a majority of the site is disturbed with the exception of small pockets of natural vegetation located along the western and northern Project site boundaries.

Eight (8) vegetation communities were identified on the Project site and in the Project’s off-site study area by the Project biologist (Glenn Lukos Associates). The Project’s off-site study area includes

proposed off-site improvements (two short roadway connections and associated storm water drainage improvements) and a buffer area. The location and extent of these vegetation communities are illustrated on Figure 2-6, *Existing Vegetation Map*, and summarized on the following pages.

- Riversidean Sage Scrub. Approximately 0.47-acre of the Project site consists of a scrub community dominated by brittlebush (*Encelia farinosa*), California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*), and coastal sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*). The understory includes a mixture of non-native grasses and native forbs. Approximately 1.11 acres of Riversidean sage scrub is located within the Project's off-site study area. (GLA, 2014, p. 24)
- Disturbed Riversidean Sage Scrub. Approximately 4.70 acres of the Project site consists of areas of Riversidean sage scrub that have been disturbed in the past. These areas have a relatively low cover of native shrubs (generally less than 15 percent), and either support a predominance of ruderal vegetation and non-native grasses, or are predominately unvegetated. Approximately 0.84-acre of disturbed Riversidean sage scrub occurs within the Project's off-site study area. (GLA, 2014, p. 24)
- Disturbed Non-Native Grassland. Approximately 153.22 acres of the Project site consists of a regularly disturbed grassland community dominated by annual (non-native) grasses. Dominant grasses include wild oat (*Avena fatua*), slender wild oat (*Avena barbata*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), red brome (*Bromus madritensis* ssp. *rubens*), and soft chess (*Bromus hordeaceus*). Additional species include deerweed (*Acmispon glaber*), black mustard (*Brassica nigra*), and fascicled tarweed (*Deinandra fasciculata*). Approximately 0.62-acre of disturbed non-native grassland is located within the Project's off-site study area. (GLA, 2014, p. 24)
- Mule Fat Scrub. Approximately 0.22-acre of the Project site consists of a riparian community dominated by mule fat (*Baccharis salicifolia*). Additional species include willow (*Salix* sp.). Approximately 1.37 acres of mule fat scrub occurs within the Project's off-site study area. (GLA, 2014, p. 25)
- Disturbed Mule Fat Scrub. Approximately 0.23-acre of the Project site consists of a disturbed riparian community comprised of sparsely growing mule fat as well as several non-native species, including Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), black mustard, and tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*). Additional species include willow (*Salix* sp.). Approximately 0.32-acre of disturbed mule fat scrub is located within the Project's off-site study area. (GLA, 2014, p. 25)
- Willow Riparian. Approximately 0.22-acre of the Project's off-site study area is comprised of a riparian community dominated by black willow (*Salix gooddingii*) and arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*). Additional species include blue elderberry (*Sambucus nigra* subsp. *Caerulea*), mule fat, and stinging nettle (*Urtica dioica*).



Legend

- Project Boundary
- Disturbed Mulefat Scrub
- Disturbed Riparian
- Disturbed Riverside Sage Scrub
- Disturbed/Developed
- Disturbed/Non-Native Grassland
- Mulefat Scrub
- Riverside Sage Scrub
- Riverside Sage Scrub/Non-Native Grassland
- Willow Riparian

Source: Glenn Lusher Associates (07-12-2014)



T&B PLANNING, INC.

Figure 2-6
 EXISTING VEGETATION MAP
 April 29, 2015

- Disturbed Riparian. Approximately 2.94 acres of the Project site consists of a riparian community that was disturbed at some time in the past. These areas exhibit a lack of cover by native riparian species such as willow (*Salix* sp.) and are dominated by non-native/ornamental species such as Mexican fan palm (*Washingtonia robusta*), Canary Island date palm (*Phoenix dactylifera*) and Peruvian pepper tree (*Schinus molle*). Additional species include black mustard, tree tobacco, and castor bean (*Ricinus communis*). Approximately 4.20 acres of disturbed riparian habitat occurs within the Project's off-site study area. (GLA, 2014, p. 25)
- Disturbed/Developed Areas. Approximately 6.55 acres of the Project site consists of disturbed/developed areas, including unvegetated dirt roads and structures. Approximately 0.70-acre of disturbed/developed areas is located in the Project's off-site study area. (GLA, 2014, pp. 23-25)

No special-status plant species were observed on the Project site during surveys conducted by Glenn Lukos Associates. Eight (8) special-status plant species have a "low" potential to occur on-site: Intermediate mariposa lily (*Calochortus weedii* var. *intermedius*), Long-spined spineflower (*Chorizanthe polygonoides* var. *longispina*), Palmer's grapplinghook (*Harpagonella palmeri*), Paniculate tarplant (*Deinandra paniculata*), Parry's spineflower (*Chorizanthe parryi* var. *parryi*), Payson's jewelflower (*Caulanthus simulans*), Small-flowered microseris (*Microseris douglasii* ssp. *platycarpa*), and Small-flowered morning glory (*Convolvulus simulans*). (GLA, 2014, pp. 25-29)

2.2.9 Wildlife

Five (5) special-status wildlife species were observed on the Project site during wildlife surveys conducted by Glenn Lukos Associates, including: Orangethroat whiptail (*Aspidoscelis hyperthra*), coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*), Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), Northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus bennettii*). (GLA, 2014, pp. 29-35)

In addition to those species observed on-site, the Project site contains suitable habitat with the potential to support other special-status animals, including the Coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*), Coast patch-nosed snake (*Salvadora hexalepis virgulata*), Coastal whiptail (*Aspidoscelis tigris*), Red-diamond rattlesnake (*Crotalus exsul*), Rosy boa (*Charina trivirgata*), Silvery legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra pulchra*), Bell's sage sparrow (*Amphispiza belli belli*), Burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Ferruginous hawk (wintering) (*Buteo regalis*), Golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), Least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*), Loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), Long-eared owl (nesting) (*Asio otus*), Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*), White-tailed kite (nesting) (*Elanus leucurus*), Yellow-breasted chat (*Icteria virens*), Yellow warbler (*Setophaga petechial*), Northwestern San Diego pocket mouse (*Chaetodipus fallax fallax*), San Diego desert woodrat (*Neotoma lepida intermedia*), Stephens' kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*), Western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*), Western yellow bat (*Lasiurus xanthinus*), Yuma Myotis (*Myotis yumanensis*). (GLA, 2014, pp. 29-35)

2.3 PLANNING CONTEXT

2.3.1 General Plan Land Use Designations

The prevailing planning document for the Project site and its surrounding area is the Riverside County General Plan. The General Plan is divided into a number of Area Plans that provide additional guidance for development. The Project site is located within the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan (LMWAP).


Both the General Plan Land Use Element and the LMWAP assign the entire Project site to the “Rural Community (RC)” Foundation Component and further designate the site for “Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)” (approximately 148 acres) and “Estate Density Residential (EDR)” (approximately 20 acres) land uses. Refer to Figure 2-7, *Existing General Plan and Area Plan Designations*. The RC-VLDR designation calls for the development of detached single-family homes on 1-acre minimum lots, while the RC-EDR designation calls for the development of detached single-family homes on 2-acre minimum lots. If the Project site were built out in accordance with its existing, underlying land use designations, a maximum of 157 residential units could be constructed on the subject property.

2.3.2 General Plan Policy Areas


General Plan Policy Areas apply to portions of an Area Plan that contain special or unique characteristics that merit detailed attention and focused planning policies. The Project site is located within the LMWAP’s El Sobrante Policy Area. The purpose of the El Sobrante Policy Area is to address the infrastructure capacity within the policy area with an emphasis on preservation of the area’s rural lifestyle.

2.3.3 Zoning Designations

The Project site is zoned for “Light Agriculture, 10-acre minimum lot size (A-1-10)” land uses (refer to Figure 2-8, *Existing Zoning Designations*). The A-1-10 zoning designation allows for the development of single-family dwellings on minimum 10-acre lots and limited, non-intensive agricultural uses.




Source(s): RCTLMA (2014)



EXISTING GENERAL PLAN AND AREA PLAN DESIGNATIONS

Figure 2-7



Source(s): RCTLMA (2014)




Figure 2-8

EXISTING GENERAL PLAN AND AREA PLAN DESIGNATIONS

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project evaluated by this MND is located within the El Sobrante area of unincorporated Riverside County, California. The proposed Project consists of applications for a General Plan Amendment (GPA 1132), Change of Zone (CZ 7816), a Tract Map (TR 36475), and an Agricultural Preserve Diminishment (AG 1044). Copies of the entitlement applications for the proposed Project are herein incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA §15150 and are available for review at the Riverside County Planning Department, located at 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA. A detailed description of the proposed Project is provided herein.

3.1 PROPOSED DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

3.1.1 General Plan Amendment 1132

General Plan Amendment 1132 (GPA 1132) proposes to amend the Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element and the LMWAP Land Use Plan land use designations as they pertain to the site from “Rural Community-Very Low Density Residential (RC-VLDR)” and “Rural Community-Estate Density Residential (RC-EDR)” to “Rural Community-Low Density Residential (RC-LDR).” The RC-LDR land use designation would allow for development of the Project site with detached single-family homes on minimum ½-acre lots (Riverside, 2013, p. LU 46). GPA 1132 would not alter the subject property’s Foundation Component assignment (Rural Community). Figure 3-1, *General Plan Amendment 1132*, illustrates the proposed General Plan and LMWAP land use designations.

3.1.2 Change of Zone 7816



Change of Zone 7816 (CZ 7816) proposes to change the zoning designation of the Project site from “Light Agriculture, 10-acre minimum lot size (A-1-10)” to “One Family Dwellings (R-1)”, which would allow for development of the subject property with detached single-family homes on minimum 7,200 square foot (s.f.) lot sizes. Figure 3-2, *Change of Zone 7816*, depicts the site’s proposed zoning designation.

3.1.3 Tract Map 36475

A. *Land Use Summary*

Tract Map 36475 (TR 36475) is shown on Figure 3-3, *Tract Map 36475*. A summary of the lots proposed to be created through subdivision of the subject property as part of TR 36475 is presented in Table 3-1, *Summary of Tract Map 36475*. As shown in Table 3-1, TR 36475 would subdivide the 168.33-acre site into 171 single-family residential lots on 79.57 acres; two (2) water quality/detention basins on 5.26 acres; four (4) park sites on 3.78 acres; and 21 open space lots on 50.56 acres. TR 36475 also would provide 29.16 acres of on-site public streets. A detailed description of the various land uses that would result from the approval of TR 36475 is provided below.

- **Single Family Residential:** TR 36475 would subdivide the Project site into 171 single-family residential lots that would range in size from 13,946 s.f. (approximately 1/3-acre) to 113,270 s.f. (approximately 2.6 acres). The minimum building pad size on each lot would be 11,916 s.f.



GENERAL INFORMATION
 1. PROJECT NAME: CITRUS HEIGHTS II
 2. PROJECT LOCATION: TRACT NO. 36475, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA
 3. PROJECT OWNER: [Name]
 4. PROJECT DEVELOPER: [Name]
 5. PROJECT ARCHITECT: [Name]
 6. PROJECT ENGINEER: [Name]
 7. PROJECT DATE: [Date]

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
 This project consists of the construction of a residential development consisting of approximately 100 single-family detached units, including associated streets, utilities, and landscaping. The project is located on Tract No. 36475, County of Riverside, California.


LEGAL DESCRIPTION
 TRACT NO. 36475, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLAT OF CITRUS HEIGHTS II, TRACT NO. 36475, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA, DATED [Date].

BASEMENTS
 All basements shall be constructed in accordance with the applicable building code requirements.


LOCAL JURISDICTION
 The project is located within the jurisdiction of the City of Riverside, California.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
 The project shall comply with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations, including but not limited to the California Building Code, California Fire Code, and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

CONTRACT DOCUMENTS
 The project shall be governed by the contract documents prepared by the project architect and engineer.



LEGEND
 [Symbol] Proposed Single-Family Detached Unit
 [Symbol] Proposed Street
 [Symbol] Proposed Utility Line
 [Symbol] Proposed Landscaping Area
 [Symbol] Proposed Concrete Interceptor/Storage Facility



LOT SUMMARY

LOT NO.	AREA (SQ. FT.)	AREA (SQ. METERS)	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL AREA
1	10,000	929.03	1.00%
2	10,000	929.03	1.00%
3	10,000	929.03	1.00%
4	10,000	929.03	1.00%
5	10,000	929.03	1.00%
6	10,000	929.03	1.00%
7	10,000	929.03	1.00%
8	10,000	929.03	1.00%
9	10,000	929.03	1.00%
10	10,000	929.03	1.00%
11	10,000	929.03	1.00%
12	10,000	929.03	1.00%
13	10,000	929.03	1.00%
14	10,000	929.03	1.00%
15	10,000	929.03	1.00%
16	10,000	929.03	1.00%
17	10,000	929.03	1.00%
18	10,000	929.03	1.00%
19	10,000	929.03	1.00%
20	10,000	929.03	1.00%
21	10,000	929.03	1.00%
22	10,000	929.03	1.00%
23	10,000	929.03	1.00%
24	10,000	929.03	1.00%
25	10,000	929.03	1.00%
26	10,000	929.03	1.00%
27	10,000	929.03	1.00%
28	10,000	929.03	1.00%
29	10,000	929.03	1.00%
30	10,000	929.03	1.00%
31	10,000	929.03	1.00%
32	10,000	929.03	1.00%
33	10,000	929.03	1.00%
34	10,000	929.03	1.00%
35	10,000	929.03	1.00%
36	10,000	929.03	1.00%
37	10,000	929.03	1.00%
38	10,000	929.03	1.00%
39	10,000	929.03	1.00%
40	10,000	929.03	1.00%
41	10,000	929.03	1.00%
42	10,000	929.03	1.00%
43	10,000	929.03	1.00%
44	10,000	929.03	1.00%
45	10,000	929.03	1.00%
46	10,000	929.03	1.00%
47	10,000	929.03	1.00%
48	10,000	929.03	1.00%
49	10,000	929.03	1.00%
50	10,000	929.03	1.00%
51	10,000	929.03	1.00%
52	10,000	929.03	1.00%
53	10,000	929.03	1.00%
54	10,000	929.03	1.00%
55	10,000	929.03	1.00%
56	10,000	929.03	1.00%
57	10,000	929.03	1.00%
58	10,000	929.03	1.00%
59	10,000	929.03	1.00%
60	10,000	929.03	1.00%
61	10,000	929.03	1.00%
62	10,000	929.03	1.00%
63	10,000	929.03	1.00%
64	10,000	929.03	1.00%
65	10,000	929.03	1.00%
66	10,000	929.03	1.00%
67	10,000	929.03	1.00%
68	10,000	929.03	1.00%
69	10,000	929.03	1.00%
70	10,000	929.03	1.00%
71	10,000	929.03	1.00%
72	10,000	929.03	1.00%
73	10,000	929.03	1.00%
74	10,000	929.03	1.00%
75	10,000	929.03	1.00%
76	10,000	929.03	1.00%
77	10,000	929.03	1.00%
78	10,000	929.03	1.00%
79	10,000	929.03	1.00%
80	10,000	929.03	1.00%
81	10,000	929.03	1.00%
82	10,000	929.03	1.00%
83	10,000	929.03	1.00%
84	10,000	929.03	1.00%
85	10,000	929.03	1.00%
86	10,000	929.03	1.00%
87	10,000	929.03	1.00%
88	10,000	929.03	1.00%
89	10,000	929.03	1.00%
90	10,000	929.03	1.00%
91	10,000	929.03	1.00%
92	10,000	929.03	1.00%
93	10,000	929.03	1.00%
94	10,000	929.03	1.00%
95	10,000	929.03	1.00%
96	10,000	929.03	1.00%
97	10,000	929.03	1.00%
98	10,000	929.03	1.00%
99	10,000	929.03	1.00%
100	10,000	929.03	1.00%

AMENDED NO. 1
 SCHEDULE 'A'
 CITRUS HEIGHTS II
 TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 36475
 COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 SHEET 1 OF 7

PREPARED FOR
 CV Communities
 PREPARED BY
 MDS
 CIVIL ENGINEERS
 ARCHITECTS
 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

Source: MDS Consulting (10-13-2010)

Table 3-1 Summary of Tract Map 36475


Lots	Land Use	Acreage	% of Project Site
1-171	Single-Family Residential	79.57	47.3%
172-173	Water Quality/ Detention Basins	5.26	3.1%
174-177	Park Sites	3.78	2.3%
'A' -'U'	Open Space	50.56	30.0%
--	Local Streets "A"- "R"	29.16	17.3%
Project Totals:		168.33	100.0%

Source: Tract Map 36475 prepared by MDS Consulting, June 10, 2014.

- **Water Quality/Detention Basins:** Two (2) water quality/detention basins are proposed on 5.26 acres. A 2.96-acre water quality/detention basin (Lot 172) is proposed in the north-central portion of TR 36475 and a 2.30-acre water quality/detention basin (Lot 173) is proposed in the northwestern portion of TR 36475.
- **Park Sites:** TR 36475 would provide four (4) park sites on 3.78 acres: Lot 174 (0.97-acre) is proposed in the northern portion of the subject property; Lot 175 (0.89-acre) is proposed in the eastern portion of the subject property; Lot 176 (1.24-acre) is proposed in the southern portion of the subject property; and Lot 177 (0.68-acre) is proposed in the southeastern portion of the subject property.
- **Open Space:** TR 36475 allocates 50.56 acres of community and natural open space. Community open space lots would accommodate community entries, common landscaped areas, and common manufactured slopes. Natural open space would remain in its natural (undisturbed) state.
- **On-Site Public Roadways:** TR 36475 proposes a total of 29.16 acres of local streets (Streets "A" through "R"). Subsection 3.1.3B, *Public Roadway Dedications, Improvements, and Vacations*, provides a more detailed description of roadway improvements planned as part of TR 36475.


B. Public Roadway Dedications, Improvements, and Vacations

As shown on Figure 3-3, TR 36475 would construct several public roadways on the site. Figure 3-4, *Roadway Cross-Sections*, depicts the improvements proposed for each of the various roadways. Access to the Project site would be provided via two (2) full access connections from an approved, neighboring development project to the north (TR 36390, marketing name "Citrus Heights"). From Citrus Heights, Project residents would have direct connections to McAllister Street and Street "A." Street "A" is also known as "Fairway Drive," an approved public street that will provide a connection between McAllister Street and Van Buren Boulevard.




STREET 'A' (PER TRACT 36390) (PUBLIC)

SCALE: 1"=10'
 (NOTE: IMPROVEMENTS PER TRACT 36390, CITRUS HEIGHTS 1 AND PROPOSED STREET 'A' PER TENTATIVE TRACT 36475 TO CONNECT)



PROPOSED STREET 'A' (PUBLIC)

SCALE: 1"=10'



PROPOSED STREETS 'B'-R' (PUBLIC)

SCALE: 1"=10'

Source: MDS Consulting (16-13-2014)



T&B PLANNING, INC.

A description of the roadway improvements planned as part of the Project is provided below.

- **Street "A":** Street "A" is a proposed on-site local street that would connect to the neighboring Citrus Heights development project at two (2) locations (forming a loop through the Project). This street would serve as the backbone road of the Project, facilitating access to all on-site local residential streets. Street "A" would provide a 60-foot wide right-of-way, including 40 feet of vehicular travel lanes and 10-foot parkways on each side of the street. On one side of the street, the parkway includes a five (5)-foot wide sidewalk that would be separated from the curb by a five (5)-foot wide landscaped parkway. On the other side of the street, the parkway would feature a four (4)-foot wide landscaped park strip adjacent to the curb and a six (6)-foot wide trail.
- **Streets "B" through "R":** Streets "B" through "R" are proposed on-site local streets that would connect individual residential lots to the community's backbone loop road (Street "A"). Streets "B" through "R" would provide a 56-foot wide right-of-way, including 36 feet of vehicular travel lanes, and 10-foot parkways on each side of the street. The parkways include five (5)-foot wide park strips adjacent to the curb and five (5)-foot wide sidewalks.

C. *Proposed Drainage and Water Quality Improvements*

On-site stormwater runoff is engineered to be conveyed through on-site public street improvements and storm drains, which generally would convey all runoff to two (2) water quality/detention basins in the northern (Lot 172) and northwestern (Lot 173) portions of the Project site, respectively. The water/quality detention basins are designed to treat all "first flush" volumes from developed portions of the Project site. Storm water runoff would be discharged from the water quality/detention basins to existing drainage courses along the northern and western boundaries of the Project site.

D. *Proposed Water Service Improvements*

Water service would be provided to the Project site by the WMWD. An 8-inch diameter domestic water line would be constructed beneath the proposed alignment of Street "A" and would connect to domestic water facilities in the Citrus Heights development to the north. Within all on-site roadways, 8-inch diameter water lines would branch off from the main line beneath Street "A" as necessary to provide domestic water service to individual lots. Reclaimed water service is not available in the Project area and is not proposed as part of the Project.

E. *Proposed Sewer Service Improvements*

Sanitary sewer service for the proposed Project would be provided by the WMWD. Waste water would be conveyed from individual lots to the 8-inch diameter backbone sewer line beneath the proposed alignment of Street "A" via 8-inch diameter sewer lines installed beneath on-site roadways. The backbone sewer line beneath Street "A" would connect to sewer facilities in the Citrus Heights development to the north.

F. Earthwork and Grading

The Project proposes to grade portions of the 168.33-acre site to facilitate development of the property pursuant to TR 36475. A total of 2,204,500 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut and 2,204,500 c.y. of fill are anticipated in association with site grading activities, with no net import/export of soil materials. Numerous manufactured slopes would be constructed on the Project site, all of which would be constructed at a maximum slope angle of 2:1.

G. Preliminary Landscape Plan

As shown on Figure 3-5, *Preliminary Landscape Plan*, a combination of trees, shrubs, and groundcovers would be planted along all on-site roadways, park sites, common open space areas, manufactured slopes, and water quality/detention basins. The Project would comply with County of Riverside Ordinance No. 859 (*Water Efficient Landscape Requirements*) and would utilize a plant palette comprised of plant materials native to Southern California or naturalized to the arid local climate. Proposed landscaping would be ornamental in nature, except within water quality/detention basins where plant materials would be selected to serve water quality functions.

H. Preliminary Wall and Fence Plan

The Project's *Preliminary Wall and Fence Plan* is depicted on Figure 3-6. As shown, six (6)-foot tall masonry walls are provided adjacent to Street "A" in instances where residential side and/or rear yards face the street. Thematic rail fencing (height of 38 inches) also is provided along Street "A," to provide a physical barrier between a planned trail and the vehicular travel way. Six (6)-foot tall solid masonry walls are generally provided along the side and rear property boundaries of individual residential lots, except that five (5)-foot tall tubular steel fencing is proposed where scenic opportunities exist. Five (5)-foot tall, tubular steel fencing is proposed along the perimeter of the water/quality detention basins.

3.1.4 Agricultural Preserve Diminishment 1044

Proposed Agricultural Preserve Diminishment 1044 (AG 1044) would remove the Project site from the El Sobrante No. 1 Agricultural Preserve. AG 1044 would not terminate the El Sobrante No. 1 Agricultural Preserve, as other property surrounding the Project site remains the in the Preserve. Additionally, AG 1044 would not terminate an active Williamson Act Contract because the Project site is not encumbered by a Williamson Act Contract. (The subject property previously was encumbered by a Williamson Act Contract; however, a Notice of Non-Renewal was filed on May 10, 1982 and the contract has lapsed.)




Figure 3-6
 PRELIMINARY WALL AND FENCE PLAN
 April 29, 2015

3.2 SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

3.2.1 Construction Characteristics

A. Proposed Physical Disturbance

Approximately 136.00 acres of the Project site would be graded or disturbed during construction. An additional 1.50 acres of off-site areas would be graded or disturbed during construction to accommodate the improvements proposed by TR 36475.

B. Anticipated Construction Schedule and Equipment

Construction activities on the Project site are expected to commence in June 2015 and last through November 2016. Implementation of the proposed Project would include the following phases of construction:

- Grading and Infrastructure Installation – 40 working days;
- Building Construction – 275 working days;
- Architectural Coatings (Painting) – 324 working days; and
- Paving – 75 working days.

Table 3-2, *Anticipated Construction Equipment*, indicates the major construction equipment that the Project Applicant anticipates construction contractor(s) would use during each phase of construction.

Table 3-2 Anticipated Construction Equipment

Activity	Equipment	Number	Hours Per Day
Grading	Excavators	2	8
	Graders	1	8
	Water Trucks	1	8
	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8
	Scrapers	2	8
	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8
Building Construction	Cranes	1	8
	Forklifts	3	8
	Generator Sets	1	8
	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8
	Welders	1	8
Architectural Coatings	Air Compressors	1	8
Paving	Pavers	2	8
	Paving Equipment	2	8
	Rollers	2	8

Source: (Urban Crossroads, 2014a, Table 3-3).

3.2.2 Proposed Operation Characteristics

The proposed Project would be operated as a residential community. As such, typical operational characteristics include residents and visitors traveling to and from the site, and leisure and maintenance activities occurring on individual residential lots and in the on-site parks, open space, and detention basins. Low levels of noise and a moderate level of exterior lighting typical of a residential community is expected.

A. Future Population

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the construction of 171 single-family homes. According to the County of Riverside Ordinance No. 460, Section 10.35, the residential land use proposed by the Project (i.e., single-family detached homes with attached garages) generate approximately 2.59 persons per dwelling unit (Ord. No. 460, 2010). The County of Riverside General Plan applies a rate of 3.01 persons per single-family home (Riverside, 2013). Accordingly, the proposed Project is expected to accommodate an estimated future population of between 443 and 515 residents.

B. Future Traffic

Traffic would be generated by the 171 homes planned for the site. As shown in Table 3-3, *Project Trip Generation Summary*, implementation of the Project would result in the generation of approximately 2,628 daily trip-ends with 128 trips occurring during the morning peak hour and 171 trips occurring during the evening peak hour.

Table 3-3 Project Trip Generation Summary

Land Use	Quantity	Units ¹	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			Daily
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
Single Family Detached Residential	171	DU	32	96	128	108	63	171	1,628

¹ DU = Dwelling Units

Source: (Urban Crossroads, 2014c, Table 4-2)

C. Maintenance Responsibilities

As shown on Figure 3-7, *Preliminary Maintenance Plan*, the Homeowners' Association would maintain all common open space areas, major manufactured slopes on private residential lots, and water quality/detention basins. Natural open space areas would be maintained by the Homeowners' Association or an appropriate public/quasi-public agency. Landscaping along Street "A" would be maintained by a County of Riverside Landscape Maintenance District. Private homeowners would be responsible for maintaining their individual lots (with the exception of major manufactured slopes maintained by the Homeowners' Association).



LEGEND

	PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL PAD/SLOPE AREA - PRIVATE MAINTENANCE BY HOMEOWNER
	H.O.A. MAINTAINED LANDSCAPE
	L.M.D. MAINTAINED LANDSCAPE
	NATURAL OPEN SPACE MAINTAINED BY H.O.A OR A PUBLIC/QUASI PUBLIC AGENCY

Source: Clark & Green (10/02/2014)



T&B PLANNING, INC.

3.2.3 Related Environmental Review and Consultation Requirements

Subsequent to approval of GPA 1132, CZ 7816, TR 36475, and AG 1044, additional discretionary actions may be necessary to implement the proposed Project. These include, but are not limited to, grading permits, encroachment permits/road improvements, drainage infrastructure improvements, water and sewer infrastructure improvements, stormwater permit(s) (NPDES), and state and federal resource agency permits. Table 3-4, *Matrix of Project Approvals/Permits*, provides a summary of the agencies responsible for subsequent discretionary approvals associated with the Project. This MND covers all federal, state and local government approvals which may be needed to construct or implement the Project, whether explicitly noted in Table 3-4 or not.

Table 3-4 Matrix of Project Approvals/Permits

Public Agency	Approvals and Decisions
Riverside County	
Proposed Project- Riverside County Discretionary Approvals	
Riverside County Board of Supervisors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approve or deny GPA 1132. ○ Approve or deny CZ 7816. ○ Approve, conditionally approve, or deny TR 36475 and AG 1044 ○ Reject or adopt this MND along with appropriate CEQA Findings.
Subsequent Riverside County Discretionary and Ministerial Approvals	
Riverside County Subsequent Implementing Approvals: Planning Department and/or Building & Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approve implementing Final Maps, Plot Plans, and/or Site Plans as may be appropriate. ○ Issue Grading Permits. ○ Issue Building Permits. ○ Approve Road Improvement Plans. ○ Issue Encroachment Permits. ○ Issue Conditional Use Permits, if required.
Other Agencies – Subsequent Approvals and Permits	
Regional Water Quality Control Board	○ Issuance of Section 401 Permit pursuant to the Clean Water Act and a storm water permit.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	○ Issuance of a Section 404 Permit pursuant to the Clean Water Act.
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	○ Issuance of a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement
Western Municipal Water District	○ Issuance of permits/approvals for required domestic water and sanitary sewer service.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: EA 42652
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): GPA 1132, CZ 7816, TR 36475, AG 1044
Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department
Address: P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409
Contact Person: Matt Straite
Telephone Number: (951) 955-8631
Applicant's Name: CV Communities, LLC
Applicant's Address: 3121 Michelson Dr., Suite 150, Irvine, CA 92612

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

- A. Project Description:** The proposed Project consists of applications for a General Plan Amendment (GPA 1132), Change of Zone (CZ 7816), Tract Map (TR 36475), and Agricultural Preserve Diminishment (AG 1044), collectively hereafter referred to as "the Project." A summary of the entitlements sought by the Project Applicant associated with the proposed Project is provided below.

General Plan Amendment 1132 (GPA 1132) proposes to re-designate the Project site from "Rural Community – Very Low Density Residential (RC-VLDR)" and "Rural Community – Estate Density Residential (RC-EDR)" land uses to "Rural Community – Low Density Residential (RC-LDR)" land uses. The RC-LDR land use designation would allow for development of the Project site with detached single-family homes at a density of 2 du/ac.

Change of Zone 7816 (CZ 7816) proposes to change the zoning designation of the Project site from "Light Agriculture, 10-acre minimum lot size (A-1-10)" to "One Family Dwellings (R-1)." The proposed R-1 zoning designation would allow single-family residential uses on minimum 7,200 square foot (s.f.) lot sizes.

Tract Map 36475 (TR 36475) proposes to subdivide the 168.3-acre property into 171 single-family residential lots ranging in size from 13,946 s.f. to 113,270 s.f.; two (2) water quality/detention basins on 5.26 acres; four (4) park sites on 3.78 acres; and 21 open space lots on 50.56 acres. TR 36475 also depicts required roadway and infrastructure improvements. Implementation of TR 36475 would require approximately 2,204,500 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut and 2,204,500 c.y. of fill; grading activities would balance on-site and no import or export would be required. Off-site grading would occur on 1.50 acres. A detailed description of TR 36475 is provided in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, of the MND.

Agricultural Preserve Diminishment (AG 1044) proposes to remove the Project site from the El Sobrante No. 1 Agricultural Preserve.

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

C. Total Project Area: 168.33 acres

Residential Acres: 79.57	Lots: 171	Units: 171	Projected No. of Residents: 443-515
Commercial Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: N/A	Est. No. of Employees: N/A
Industrial Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: N/A	Est. No. of Employees: N/A
Other: Parks: 3.78 acres; Water Quality/Detention Basins: 5.26 acres; Open Space: 50.56 acres; Circulation (Streets "A"- "R,"): 29.16 acres.			

- D. Assessor's Parcel No(s):** 270-070-004, 270-080-017, 270-090-001, 270-090-002
- E. Street References:** North of El Sobrante Road, south of Dove Canyon Road, east of McAllister Street, and west of Vista del Lago Drive
- F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:** Sections 32 and 33, Township 3 South, Range 5 West, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian
- G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings:** The Project site consists of an irregularly shaped collection of contiguous parcels in the El Sobrante area of unincorporated Riverside County. The property is vacant and undeveloped, and is characterized by generally rugged terrain. The property was previously utilized for agricultural land uses, and has been heavily used by unauthorized off-road vehicles that formed dirt access roads, motorcycle and bicycle trails, and tire ruts across the entire site. An abandoned corrugated steel barn is located in the eastern portion of the Project site.

The surrounding area is occupied by rural and low-density land uses to the northeast, east, south and west. Vacant land is located north of the Project site, which is approved by the County of Riverside for development as a master-planned residential community (SP325A1 and TR 36390, known as "Citrus Heights").

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

- 1. Land Use:** The Project site is located within the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan (LMWAP). Upon approval of proposed GPA 1132, the proposed density of residential uses on the Project site will be consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element and the LMWAP Land Use Map. The proposed Project meets all other applicable land use policies of the Riverside County General Plan and the LMWAP, including the El Sobrante Policy Area.
- 2. Circulation:** The proposed Project was reviewed by the Riverside County Transportation Department and was found to be in conformance with County Ordinance, No. 461 (Road Improvement Standards and Specifications). Adequate circulation facilities exist or are planned to serve the proposed development associated with TR 36475. The proposed Project adheres to all applicable circulation policies of the Riverside County General Plan.
- 3. Multipurpose Open Space:** The General Plan and LMWAP do not designate the Project site for open space or for conservation by the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The Project site is not located in the MSHCP Criteria Area. Additionally, the Project site is not designated as mineral resource land. The proposed Project adheres to all applicable Multipurpose Open Space Element policies of the Riverside County General Plan.
- 4. Safety:** The Project site is located in Southern California, which is a seismically active area subject to ground shaking during a seismic event. The Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone or a County designated Fault Hazard Zone. Construction as required by the California Building Standards Code (CBSC) would satisfactorily address structural stability related to seismic safety. The Project site is not located in a flood hazard area or an area subject to blowsand (erosion). The Project site is located in a high fire hazard area; however, the Project is designed to minimize hazards associated with wildfires. In addition, the Project is designed to accommodate the sufficient provision of emergency

response services and was reviewed by the Riverside County Fire Department for compliance with all applicable fire protection requirements. The proposed Project adheres to all other applicable policies of the Riverside County General Plan Safety Element.

5. **Noise:** The proposed Project adheres to all applicable policies specified in the Riverside County General Plan Noise Element.
 6. **Housing:** The Riverside County General Plan Housing Element does not contain any policies applicable to the proposed Project, but rather identifies programs and actions to achieve the County's goals with respect to housing. The proposed Project relates to the County General Plan Housing Element through the Project's proposed residential land use of the property. The density of residential use proposed by the Project would not adversely impact the implementation of the County General Plan Housing Element's goals or policies.
 7. **Air Quality:** The proposed Project is conditioned to control fugitive dust emissions during grading and construction activities and to reduce air pollutant emissions to the greatest feasible extent. The proposed Project is consistent with all other applicable Riverside County General Plan Air Quality Element policies.
- B. General Plan Area Plan(s):** Lake Mathews/Woodcrest
- C. Foundation Component(s):** Rural Community
- D. Land Use Designation(s):** Estate Density Residential (EDR) and Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)
- E. Overlay(s), if any:** None
- F. Policy Area(s), if any:** El Sobrante Policy Area
- G. Adjacent and Surrounding Area Plan(s), Foundation Component(s), Land Use Designation(s), and Overlay(s) and Policy Area(s), if any:**
1. **Area Plan(s)/Neighborhood(s):** Elsinore Area Plan to the south; Mead Valley Area Plan to the east; Temescal Canyon Area Plan to the west.
 2. **Foundation Component(s):** Community Development to the north; Rural Community to the east, south, and west; Open Space to the northwest
 3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Specific Plan No. 325 (Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Open Space-Recreation) to the north; Conservation to the northwest, Estate Density Residential and Very Low Density Residential to the east; Very Low Density Residential and Low Density Residential to the south and west.
 4. **Overlay(s):** None.
 5. **Policy Area(s):** El Sobrante Policy Area to the north, south, east, and west.
- H. Adopted Specific Plan Information**
1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** None
 2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** None

I. Existing Zoning: Light Agriculture, 10-acre minimum lot size (A-1-10)

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: One Family Dwellings (R-1)

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Specific Plan to the north; R-A to the northeast; A-1-10 and R-A-5 to the east; A-1-10 to the south and west

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, **NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED** because (a) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible.

I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An **ADDENDUM** to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.

I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a **SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.

I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a **SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any the following:(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or,(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.



Signature

4/30/15

Date

Matt Straite
Printed Name

For Steve Weiss, Director

V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
AESTHETICS Would the project				
1. Scenic Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a, LMWAP, Figure 9; Google Earth 2014; On-site Inspection; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) There are no "Designated" scenic highways in the vicinity of the Project site. The Project site is located approximately 0.5-mile north of El Sobrante Road, approximately 1.5 miles east of La Sierra Avenue, and approximately 1.7 miles west of Mockingbird Canyon Road, each of which are designated as an "Eligible" scenic highway by the LMWAP. Due to the existing rolling terrain of the surrounding area and existing intervening development, the Project site is not visible from any of these "Eligible" scenic highways. Accordingly, the proposed Project has no potential to substantially affect the aesthetic quality of a scenic highway corridor.

b) The Project site is a 168.3-acre undeveloped parcel of land, previously used for agricultural production and currently fallow/vacant. The property has been heavily used by unauthorized off-road vehicle use resulting in the formation of dirt access roads, motorcycle and bicycle trails, and tire ruts across the entire site. Under existing conditions the site contains minimal vegetation due to this unauthorized vehicle use and routine maintenance activities (i.e., discing). What vegetation does exist on-site occurs in the natural drainage features located along portions of the subject property's western and northern boundaries. The Project site does not contain any prominent trees or unique landmark features; therefore, the Project would have no potential to substantially damage these scenic resources. The Project site does contain several isolated rock outcroppings, most of which occur in the western portion of the Project site and would be preserved in open space areas by the Project.

There are no designated scenic vistas on-site or in the surrounding area as identified in the Riverside County General Plan or the LMWAP. Distant views of off-site topographic landforms are available from

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

the Project site vicinity; however, proposed residential homes on the Project site would be restricted to a maximum height of 40 feet and would not obstruct views of distant, off-site landforms from off-site public viewing areas in the Project site vicinity. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not obstruct a prominent vista open to the public.

The proposed Project calls for a planned residential community that consists of 171 one- or two-story single-family homes, open space areas, and community parks, none of which would be considered aesthetically offensive. Furthermore, landscaping within the proposed development would be maintained by a County of Riverside Landscape Maintenance District and the Homeowners' Association to ensure that landscaping does not present adverse visual conditions. With respect to the visual character of the surrounding area, the proposed Project is required to comply with the Riverside County Municipal Code and County-wide Design Guidelines, and the proposed homes would be similar in character to the approved, planned residential development to the north (Citrus Heights) and the existing one-family dwellings to the northeast. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant

As indicated in the above analysis, the proposed Project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory

a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?

Source: Ordinance No. 655; County of Riverside, 2003a, LMWAP, Figure 6; RCLIS, 2014

Findings of Fact: The Project site is not located within the Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area as defined by Ordinance No. 655. The Project site is located approximately 47 miles northwest of the Mt. Palomar Observatory and falls outside of the Policy Area's 45-mile radius around the Observatory. Therefore, the proposed Project has no potential to create lighting levels that could adversely affect the operation of this facility. Accordingly, the proposed Project has no potential to interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory. No impact would occur as a result of implementation of the Project.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. Other Lighting Issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Ordinance No. 461; Ordinance No. 915; On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a & b) As a proposed residential community, lighting elements that would be installed for the Project would be of low intensity and residential in character – primarily consisting of lights installed on individual residential lots, lights installed in on-site parks, and street lights – and would not result in the exposure of on- or off-site residential property to unacceptable levels.

All lighting proposed by the Project would be required to comply with Riverside County Outdoor Lighting Standards (Ordinance No. 915). Compliance with Ordinance No. 915 would be assured through future County review of building permit applications. All proposed street lighting on- and off-site would be required to comply with provisions of the County’s Public Road Standards, which implement the provisions of Ordinance No. 461. The County’s Public Road Standards require that all street lights installed within the public right-of-way must comply with the following requirement: “Luminaries shall be cut off, high pressure sodium type...” The requirement to provide fully cut off high pressure sodium street lights would ensure that street lights constructed on- and off-site would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would affect day or nighttime views, and further would ensure that street lights constructed on- and off-site do not expose on- or off-site residential properties to unacceptable light levels. Accordingly, with mandatory compliance with Ordinance Nos. 461 and 915, the proposed Project would not create a new source of light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, nor would the Project expose residential property to unacceptable property to unacceptable light levels. Impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES Would the project

4. Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Ordinance No. 625; RCLIS, 2014; CDC, 2008; CDC, 2010; Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site does not contain any lands designated as "Prime Farmland," "Unique Farmland," or "Farmland of Statewide Importance" as mapped by the State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). As such, the Project has no potential to convert such lands to a non-agricultural use and no impact would occur. The FMMP classifies portions of the property as "Farmland of Local Importance," however, there are no General Plan policies requiring the conservation of "Farmland of Local Importance." Because the proposed Project would not directly or indirectly convert areas mapped by the FMMP as "Prime Farmland," "Unique Farmland," or "Farmland of Statewide Importance" to non-agricultural use, no impact would occur.

b) The Project site is zoned for agricultural land uses (Light Agriculture, A-1-10). The residential land uses proposed by the Project would be inconsistent with the A-1-10 zoning designation. However, the Project includes a request to change the zoning designation of the subject property from classification from A-1-10 to a residential designation (One-Family Dwellings, R-1). Upon implementation of the Project, any potential inconsistency with agricultural zoning would be eliminated. Therefore, impacts related to a conflict with agriculture zoning are determined to be less than significant.

Under existing conditions, the Project site is not used for agricultural activities nor are there any active agricultural operations adjacent to the Project site. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not conflict with an existing agricultural use.

The Project site is not burdened by an active Williamson Act contract. An approximately 148-acre portion of the Project site was previously subject to a Williamson Act contract; however, a Notice of Nonrenewal was filed in May 1982 to initiate the cancellation procedure for the site's contract. Pursuant to the provisions of the Williamson Act, the contract termination process begins on the next anniversary date following the filing of the Notice of Nonrenewal (the anniversary date for the Project site was January 1), and the contract winds down over a term of nine (9) years. Therefore, the Williamson Act covering the Project site expired in 1992, and the Project site is no longer obligated to remain in agricultural production. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with the terms of a Williamson Act contract.

Although the Project site is not subject to an active Williamson Act contract, the Project site is located within an agricultural preserve (El Sobrante No. 1). The Agricultural Preserve precludes use of the Project site for any use other than agriculture uses; however, the Project site has been vacant and not used for agricultural purposes since approximately 2005. The Project includes a request to remove the Project site from the El Sobrante No. 1 Agricultural Preserve area (AG 1044). Approval of AG 1044 would eliminate an existing inconsistency with the Agricultural Preserve (due to the fact that the Project site is not used for agricultural purposes) and would eliminate any potential inconsistency that may result from future development of the subject property with residential land uses.

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

In conclusion, the Project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning or agricultural use and would not conflict with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or Riverside County Agricultural Preserve. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) The Project site is located within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned properties. Land to the east, south and west of the Project site are zoned "Light Agriculture (A-1-10)." The Project would be required to comply with Ordinance No. 625 ("Right-to-Farm Ordinance"), which protects agricultural operations from nuisance complaints and encourages the development, improvement, and long-term viability of agricultural land where the landowner desires to continue agricultural operations in spite of urbanization that may occur in the surrounding areas. Mandatory compliance with Ordinance No. 625 would ensure that Project-related construction and operational activities would not indirectly cause or contribute to the conversion of off-site farmland to non-agricultural use. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) "Farmland" is defined in Section II (a) of Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines to mean Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. As described under Issue 4(a), above, there are no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance resources on the Project site. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not directly result in the conversion of Farmland resources to non-agricultural use. Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with Ordinance No. 625 ("Right-to-Farm Ordinance"), which protects agricultural operations from nuisance complaints and encourages the development, improvement, and long-term viability of agricultural land (refer to Issue 4(c), above). Mandatory compliance with Ordinance No. 625 would ensure that Project-related construction and operational activities would not indirectly cause or contribute to the conversion of off-site Farmland resources to non-agricultural use. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

5. Forest

a) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Govt. Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a, Open Space Element, LMWAP; RCLIS, 2014; GLA, 2014a; Google Earth 2014; Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) No portion of the Project site or surrounding area is zoned for forest land or timberland, nor are any forest lands or timberlands located on or nearby the Project site. Because no parcels zoned for

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

forest land or timberland are present, the Project has no potential to impact such zoning. No impact would occur.

b & c) The Project site does not contain any forest lands, is not zoned for forest lands, nor is it identified as containing forest resources by the General Plan. Based on a biological survey conducted on the Project site by Glenn Lukos Associates (GLA), no forest land vegetation communities are present on the property or immediately surrounding the property. Because forest land is not present on the Project site, the proposed Project has no potential to result in the loss of forest land or convert forest land or a non-forest use. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. Air Quality Impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014a; SCAQMD, 2012; SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB or "Basin"). The SCAB encompasses approximately 6,745 square miles and includes Orange County and the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. The SCAB is bound by the Pacific Ocean to the west; the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east, respectively; and the San Diego County line to the south. In these areas, the SCAQMD is principally responsible for air pollution control, and works directly with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), county transportation commissions, local governments, as well as state and federal agencies to reduce emissions from stationary, mobile, and indirect sources to meet state and federal ambient air quality standards

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

Currently, these state and federal air quality standards are exceeded in most parts of the Basin. In response, the SCAQMD has adopted a series of Air Quality Management Plans (AQMPs) to meet the state and federal ambient air quality standards. AQMPs are updated regularly in order to more effectively reduce emissions, accommodate growth, and to minimize any negative fiscal impacts of air pollution control on the economy. The current AQMP was adopted by SCAQMD in December 2012. The 2012 AQMP incorporates the latest scientific and technological information and planning assumptions, including SCAG's 2012 *Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* and updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories. The proposed Project's consistency with the 2012 AQMP is discussed as follows:

Criteria for determining consistency with the AQMP are defined in Chapter 12, Section 12.2 and Section 12.3 of the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook (1993)*. The Project's consistency with these criteria is discussed below.

Consistency Criterion No. 1: The proposed Project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP.

Consistency Criterion No. 1 refers to violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). As evaluated under Issues 5.3(b), (c), and (d), below, the Project would not exceed regional or localized significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant during construction or during long-term operation. Accordingly, the Project's regional and localized emissions would not contribute substantially to an existing or potential future air quality violation or delay the attainment of air quality standards.

Consistency Criterion No. 2: The proposed project will not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP or increments based on the years of project build-out phase.

The growth forecasts used in the AQMP to project future emissions levels are based on the projections of the Regional Transportation Model utilized by SCAG, which incorporates land use data provided by lead agency general plan documentation, as well as assumptions regarding population number, location of population growth, and a regional housing needs assessment. The General Plan and LMWAP designate the Project for the ultimate development of up to 157 single-family homes. The Project proposes to develop the subject property with 171 single-family homes, which is 14 more than designated by the General Plan and LMWAP and therefore assumed in the AQMP. Although the Project would increase the development intensity of the Project site above growth projections, the increase in intensity would be minimal (14 homes) and would not result in substantial unanticipated air pollutant emissions. Also, there is a residential dwelling unit cap applied to properties in the El Sobrante Policy Area of the LMWAP. This cap cannot be exceeded; and, based upon the number of units that have been approved or developed in this Policy Area to date, there is no potential that the Project's proposed addition of 14 residential homes on the Project site would exceed this cap. Furthermore, as described under Issues 5.3(b), (c), and (d), below, the Project would not contribute substantially to an existing or potential future air quality violation or delay the attainment of air quality standards and would, therefore, be consistent with the intent of the AQMP.

For the reasons stated above, the proposed Project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP.

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

Furthermore, the Project would not substantially exceed the growth assumptions in the AQMP. As such, the Project would be consistent with the AQMP and impacts would be less than significant.

b & c) As with any new development project, the proposed Project has the potential to generate substantial pollutant concentrations during both construction activities and long-term operation. The following provides an analysis based on the applicable significance thresholds established by the SCAQMD and Federal and State air quality standards. This analysis assumes that the proposed Project would comply with applicable, mandatory regional air quality standards, including: SCAQMD Rule 403, "Fugitive Dust;" SCAQMD Rule 431.2, "Sulfur Content of Liquid Fuels;" SCAQMD Rule 1113, "Architectural Coatings;" SCAQMD Rule 1186, "PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads, and Livestock Operations;" SCAQMD Rule 1186.1, "Less-Polluting Street Sweepers," and Title 13, Chapter 10, Section 2485, Division 3 of the California Code of Regulations "Airborne Toxic Control Measure."

For a detailed discussion of air pollutant emissions and their associated health effects, refer to Section 2.6 of the Project's Air Quality Impact Analysis (Appendix A).

Impact Analysis for Construction Emissions

For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that construction of the Project would begin in June 2015 and last through November 2016. If construction activities actually occur at a slightly later date than assumed in this Initial Study, emissions associated with construction vehicle exhaust would be less than disclosed below due to the application of more restrictive regulatory requirements for construction equipment and the ongoing replacement of older construction fleet equipment with newer, less-polluting equipment by construction contractors, as contained in the CalEEMod model. The Project's construction characteristics and construction equipment fleet assumptions used in the analysis were previously described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*.

The calculated maximum daily emissions associated with construction of the Project are presented in Table 1, *Summary of Construction-Related Emissions*.

Table 1 Summary of Construction-Related Emissions

Year	Emissions (pounds per day)					
	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
2015	13.25	87.91	55.44	0.07	7.79	5.31
2016	12.82	38.41	35.76	0.06	4.30	2.80
Maximum Daily Emissions	13.25	87.91	55.44	0.07	7.79	5.31
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Note: Refer to Appendix A of the Air Quality Impact Analysis (Appendix A) for the CalEEMod™ output files and additional hand calculations for the estimated emissions.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014a, Table 3-4

As shown in Table 1, Project-related construction emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Sulfur Oxides (SO_x), and Particulate Matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) would not exceed SCAQMD regional criteria thresholds. Accordingly, the Project would not emit substantial concentrations of these pollutants during the construction phase and would not contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, on a direct or cumulatively considerable basis. Impacts

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

associated with construction-related emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

Impact Analysis for Operational Emissions

The proposed Project would be operated as a residential community. As such, typical operational characteristics include residents and visitors traveling to and from the proposed residences and parks, leisure and maintenance activities occurring on individual residential lots and in the on-site park and trail system, and general maintenance of common areas. Long-term operational emissions associated with the Project are presented in Table 2, *Summary of Operational Emissions*.

Table 2 Summary of Operational Emissions

Operational Activities – Summer Scenario	Emissions (pounds per day)					
	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area Source	10.27	0.17	14.36	7.50e-4	0.31	0.30
Energy Source	0.16	1.38	0.59	8.81e-3	0.11	0.11
Mobile	6.50	18.84	77.29	0.18	12.55	3.53
Maximum Daily Emissions	16.94	20.39	92.24	0.19	12.97	3.95
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Operational Activities – Winter Scenario	Emissions (pounds per day)					
	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area Source	10.27	0.17	14.36	7.50e-4	0.31	0.30
Energy Source	0.16	1.38	0.59	8.81e-3	0.11	0.11
Mobile	6.71	19.82	75.64	0.17	12.55	3.53
Maximum Daily Emissions	17.15	21.37	90.58	0.18	12.97	3.95
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Note: Refer to Appendix A of the Air Quality Impact Analysis (Appendix A) for the CalEEMod™ output files and additional hand calculations for the estimated emissions.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014a, Table 3-5

As summarized in Table 2, emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} resulting from Project operation would not exceed SCAQMD regional criteria thresholds. Accordingly, the Project would not emit substantial concentrations of these pollutants during operation and would not contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, on a direct or cumulatively considerable basis. Impacts associated with operational-related emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

Conclusion

As indicated in the above analysis, the Project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation during construction or operational activities. Additionally, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air

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

quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

d) The following provides an analysis of the Project's potential to expose sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the Project site to substantial pollutant concentrations during Project construction and long-term operation. The following provides an analysis based on the applicable significance thresholds established by the SCAQMD. This analysis assumes that the proposed Project would comply with applicable, mandatory regional air quality standards, including: SCAQMD Rule 403, "Fugitive Dust;" SCAQMD Rule 431.2, "Sulfur Content of Liquid Fuels;" SCAQMD Rule 1113, "Architectural Coatings;" SCAQMD Rule 1186, "PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads, and Livestock Operations;" SCAQMD Rule 1186.1, "Less-Polluting Street Sweepers," and Title 13, Chapter 10, Section 2485, Division 3 of the California Code of Regulations "Airborne Toxic Control Measure."

For a detailed discussion of air pollutant emissions and their associated health effects, refer to Section 2.6 of the Project's Air Quality Impact Analysis (Appendix A).

Impact Analysis for Construction Localized Emissions

Sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the Project site, including but not limited to the residences located to the northeast, east, and west of the Project site, would be exposed to localized emissions (e.g., construction equipment tailpipe emissions, dust) during Project construction. Table 3, *Summary of Construction Localized Emissions*, presents the estimated localized emissions concentrations associated with construction activities on the Project site.

Table 3 Summary of Construction Localized Emissions

On-Site Grading Emissions	Emissions (pounds per day)			
	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Maximum Daily Emissions	87.78	54.01	7.56	5.25
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	236.67	1,345.67	11	6.67
Threshold Exceeded?	NO	NO	NO	NO

Note: Refer to Appendix A of the Air Quality Impact Analysis (Appendix A) for the CalEEMod™ output files and additional hand calculations for the estimated emissions.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014a, Table 3-7

As summarized in Table 3, Project-related construction emissions of NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} would not exceed the SCAQMD's significance thresholds. Accordingly, proposed construction of the Project would not expose sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project site to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.

Although the Project's localized construction emissions would be less than significant, the Project's Air Quality Impact Analysis (Appendix A) assumed that no more than 4.0 acres of the Project site would be graded on any given day during the grading phase of construction. Accordingly, this Initial Study recommends mitigation to ensure that Project-related construction activities do not exceed the assumptions of the Air Quality Impact Analysis (see M-AQ-1, below).

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

Impact Analysis for Operational Localized Emissions

Substantial localized operational emissions are typically associated with the operation of land uses that include stationary emissions sources (e.g., refineries, industrial plants, etc.) or would attract/generate diesel trucks that may spend long periods of time queuing or idling at a project site (e.g., warehouses, transfer facilities, etc.). The proposed Project consists of a master-planned residential community with supporting recreation and open space land uses. The land uses proposed for the Project site (residential homes, parks, and open space) would not attract or generate substantial diesel truck traffic during long-term operation. Table 4, *Summary of Operational Localized Emissions*, presents the estimated localized emissions concentrations associated with Project operation.

Table 4 Summary of Operational Localized Emissions

Operational Activity	Emissions (pounds per day)			
	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Maximum Daily Emissions	2.54	18.81	1.05	0.59
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,577	4	2
Threshold Exceeded?	NO	NO	NO	NO

Note: Refer to Appendix A of the Air Quality Impact Analysis (Appendix A) for the CalEEMod™ output files and additional hand calculations for the estimated emissions.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014a, Table 3-8

As summarized in Table 4, the Project's localized emissions of NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} would be substantially below the SCAQMD's significance thresholds. Accordingly, long-term operation of the Project as a master-planned residential community would not expose sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project site to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

CO "Hot Spot"

Localized areas where ambient CO concentrations exceed CAAQS and/or NAAQS standards are termed CO "hot spots." Emissions of CO are produced in greatest quantities from motor vehicle combustion and are usually concentrated at or near ground level because they do not readily disperse into the atmosphere, particularly under cool, stable (i.e., low or no wind) atmospheric conditions. Consequently, the highest CO concentrations are generally found within close proximity to congested intersection locations.

Carbon monoxide decreased dramatically in the SCAB with the introduction of the catalytic converter in 1975. No exceedances of CO have been recorded at monitoring stations in the SCAB for at least the last three (3) years and the SCAB is currently designated as a CO attainment area for both the CAAQS and NAAQS. Table 2-3 of the Air Quality Impact Analysis (Appendix A) indicates that the maximum CO levels over the last three (3) years are 4.5 parts per million (ppm) (1-hour average) and 1.6 ppm (8-hour average) as compared to the CAAQS threshold of 20 ppm (1-hour average) and 9.0 ppm (8-hour average) (Urban Crossroads, 2014a, p. 12). It is not expected that CO levels at intersections that would receive Project-related traffic would rise to such a degree so as to exceed the CAAQS threshold.

For purposes of providing a conservative, worst-case impact analysis, the potential for the proposed Project to cause or contribute to CO hotspots is evaluated by comparing impacted Project intersections

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

(both intersection geometry and traffic volumes) with prior studies conducted by the SCAQMD in support of their AQMPs. In the 2003 AQMP, the SCAQMD evaluated CO concentrations at four (4) busy intersections in the City of Los Angeles. Each of the evaluated intersections were primary thoroughfares, some of which were located near major freeway on/off ramps, and experienced traffic volumes of nearly 100,000 vehicles per day. SCAQMD did not observe any CO "hot spots" at any of these busy intersections. The intersections in the Project area have peak hour traffic volumes of less than 6,000 vehicles per day, which is much less than the 100,000 vehicles per day studied in Los Angeles and found to be less than significant. The proposed Project consists of single-family residential uses and would not substantially change the number of vehicles at intersections in the Project vicinity. Thus, Project-related vehicular emissions would not create a CO "hot spot" and would not substantially contribute to an existing or projected CO "hot spot". Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation is not required. (Urban Crossroads, 2014a, p. 31)

Conclusion

As indicated in the above analysis, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial localized emissions during construction of operation. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

e) Under existing conditions, land uses within one mile of the Project site largely consist of residential uses, agricultural uses, and undeveloped land/open space. There are no existing uses within one mile of the Project site that land uses that include stationary emissions sources (e.g., refineries, industrial plants, etc.) or would attract/generate diesel trucks that may spend long periods of time queuing or idling at the Project site (e.g., warehouses, transfer facilities, etc.). Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter, and no impact would occur.

f) Proposed construction activities at the Project site could produce odors from equipment exhaust, application of asphalt, and/or the application of architectural coatings. However, any odors emitted during construction would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature, and would cease upon completion of construction activities. Furthermore, standard construction practices would minimize odor emissions and their associated impacts and construction activities would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402, which prohibits the discharge of odorous emissions that would create a public nuisance. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not create objectionable odors during construction activities, and short-term impacts would be less than significant.

During long-term operation, the proposed Project would include residential, recreation, and open space land uses, which are not typically associated with objectionable odors. The temporary storage of refuse and the placement of refuse containers on the streets for collection in the residential neighborhood could be a source of odor; however, Project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the County's solid waste regulations, thereby precluding any potential impact. In addition, the proposed Project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402, which prohibits the discharge of odorous emissions that would create a public nuisance, during long-term operation. As such, long-term operation of the Project would not create objectionable odors and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation:

M-AQ-1 (Condition of Approval 70.Planning 003) Prior to grading permit issuance, the County shall verify that the following note is included on the grading plan. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the note and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by County of Riverside staff or its designee to confirm compliance. The note also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.

- a. Mass grading activities shall be limited to no more than 4.0 acres of active ground disturbance per day. The construction contractor shall maintain a written log or map of daily mass grading activities, which shall be available for County of Riverside inspection upon request.

Monitoring:

M-AQ-1 The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall review implementing grading plans for compliance with the above-specified requirements and conduct periodic inspection of the grading operation.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project

7. Wildlife & Vegetation

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Ordinance No. 663, 1996; Ordinance No. 810, 2003; RCLIS, 2014; Western Riverside County MSHCP; GLA, 2014; GLA, 2015; On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is located within the boundaries of two habitat conservation plans (HCPs), "The Habitat Conservation Plan for the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat in Western Riverside County, California" and the "Western Riverside County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSHCP)."

A biological survey of the Project site was concluded by Glenn Lukos Associates (GLA). According to the biological field survey report (refer to Appendix B), the Stephens' kangaroo rat (SKR) was not observed on the site but the species does have the potential to occur on the site. The Project site is located within the SKR Fee Assessment Area as established by the SKR HCP. As such, the Project is subject to mandatory payment of the per-acre local development mitigation fee pursuant to Riverside County Ordinance No. 663. With mandatory fee payment, which will be made a condition of Project approval by the County of Riverside, the proposed Project would be consistent with the SKR HCP and impacts would be less than significant.

The following is an analysis of the proposed Project's compliance with the Western Riverside County MSHCP's Reserve Assembly Requirements, as well as other applicable MSHCP requirements. The Western Riverside County MSHCP, a regional HCP, was adopted on June 17, 2003, and an Implementing Agreement (IA) was executed between the USFWS, CDFW, and participating entities. The intent of the MSHCP is to preserve native vegetation and meet the habitat needs of multiple species, rather than focusing preservation efforts on one species at a time. As such, the MSHCP streamlines the review of individual projects with respect to the species and habitats addressed in the MSHCP and provides for an overall Conservation Area (also called MSHCP Reserve) that would be of greater benefit to biological resources than would result from a piecemeal regulatory approach. The MSHCP provides coverage (including take authorization for listed species) for special-status plant and animal species, as well as mitigation for impacts to sensitive species. The proposed Project is subject to mandatory payment of the MSHCP per-acre local development mitigation fee pursuant to Riverside County Ordinance No. 810.

The Project site occurs within the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan portion of the MSHCP. The Project site does not occur within one of the Criteria Cells of the MSHCP, established for the acquisition of habitat for the conservation of habitat and sensitive plant and wildlife species. Because the Project site is not in a Criteria Cell, it is not subject to the Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS) process or the Joint Project Review (JPR) process outlined by the MSHCP and is not planned for open space preservation. (GLA, 2014, p. 4)

Although habitat conservation is not required on the Project site pursuant to the MSHCP, all projects must demonstrate compliance with applicable MSHCP requirements in accordance with the following sections of the MSHCP: Section 6.1.2, "Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools;" Section 6.1.3, "Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species;" Section 6.1.4, "Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildland Interface;" and Section 6.3.2, "Additional Survey Needs and Procedures."

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

Project Compliance With MSHCP Section 6.1.2 "Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools"

Volume 1, Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP describes the process to protect species associated with riparian/riverine areas and vernal pools. The MSHCP requires focused surveys for sensitive riparian bird species when suitable habitat would be affected and surveys for sensitive fairy shrimp species when vernal pools or other suitable habitat would be affected.

Riparian/Riverine Areas

The Project site contains approximately 3.78 acres of MSHCP riparian/riverine areas, of which 3.40 acres consist of various riparian communities and 0.38-acre consists of unvegetated riverine areas. The Project's off-site study area, which includes a proposed off-site improvement area and a buffer area, contains approximately 6.11 acres of MSHCP riparian/riverine areas, comprised of various riparian communities. (GLA, 2015, pp. 4-5)

The Project would impact approximately 0.53-acre of MSHCP riparian communities, including approximately 0.34-acre on-site and approximately 0.19-acre off-site, as well as 0.33-acre of MSHCP riverine areas (i.e., unvegetated streambed) on-site (GLA, 2014, Table 5-1; GLA, 2015, p. 7). Pursuant to the requirements of the MSHCP, impacts to riparian/riverine area must be mitigated such that the resulting project, with mitigation, is biologically equivalent or superior to the existing site conditions. A Determination of Biological Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) analysis was prepared for the Project (refer to Appendix C) to evaluate potential impacts to riparian/riverine areas and recommend mitigation to replace lost functions and values as it pertains to the MSHCP Covered Species. The DBESP analysis is required to be provided to CDFW and USFWS for a 60-day review and response period. With the County's approval of the DBESP, which shall occur prior to public hearings for the proposed Project, and with implementation of the required mitigation (refer to Mitigation Measures M-BI-1 through M-BI-6), the proposed Project would be consistent the MSHCP riparian/riverine policies. (GLA, 2015, p. 10)

Least Bell's Vireo, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, and Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo

The least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, and western yellow-billed cuckoo were not observed on the Project site or within the off-site study area during biological protocol surveys conducted by GLA. The southwestern willow flycatcher and western yellow-billed cuckoo are not expected within the Project area due to the marginality of on- and off-site habitat; however, there is low to moderate potential for the least Bell's vireo to use the Project site (GLA, 2014, pp. 32-34). Therefore, the proposed Project would not impact habitat occupied by the southwestern willow flycatcher or western yellow-billed cuckoo, but does have the potential to impact habitat used by the least Bell's vireo. With implementation of the required mitigation (refer to Mitigation Measures M-BI-1 through M-BI-6), the proposed Project would be consistent with MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.1.2 as it pertains to these species. (GLA, 2014, p. 52)

Vernal Pools

The Project site and off-site study area do not contain any MSHCP vernal pools. As such, the Project would not impact any vernal pools and would be consistent with MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.1.2 as it pertains to vernal pools. (GLA, 2014, p. 53)

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

Fairy Shrimp

The Project site and off-site study area do not contain habitat suitable to support listed fairy shrimp. Therefore, there is no potential for the Project to impact fairy shrimp. As such, the Project would be consistent with MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.1.2 as it pertains to listed fairy shrimp. (GLA, 2014, p. 53)

Project Compliance with MSHCP Section 6.1.3 "Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species"

Volume 1, Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP requires that within Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Areas (NEPSSA), site-specific focused surveys for Narrow Endemic Plants Species will be required for all public and private projects where appropriate soils and habitat are present. The Project site and off-site study area are not located within the NEPSSA; therefore, focused surveys for NEPSSA species are not required. As such, the proposed Project would be consistent with Volume I, Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP. (GLA, 2014, p. 53)

Project Compliance with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 "Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildland Interface"

The MSHCP Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines are intended to address indirect effects ("edge effects") associated with locating development in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area. The Project site is not located adjacent to any MSHCP conservation areas. However, the MSHCP also states that edge treatments shall also be addressed as part of the avoidance and minimization process for areas not included in the MSHCP Conservation Area. The Project proposes to provide 50.56 acres of open space on the property, of which approximately 32.33 acres would be natural open space. Therefore, the MSHCP Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines apply to the natural open space habitat on the Project site, even though these areas would not be part of the MSHCP Conservation Area.

In order to ensure consistency with the minimization measures specified in MSHCP Section 6.1.4, mitigation measures (refer to Mitigation Measures M-BI-7 and M-BI-8) have been imposed on the Project to ensure that indirect impacts to sensitive natural biological resources located on-site and within close proximity to the Project site would not occur (e.g., impacts due to drainage, toxic substances, lighting, noise, invasive species, and barrier measures). With the implementation of these measures, the proposed Project would be consistent with the MSHCP Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines contained in MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.1.4 (GLA, 2014, p. 54).

A summary of the Project's potential indirect impacts to sensitive natural biological resources is provided below.

Drainage

Proposed projects in Riverside County are required to incorporate measures, including measures required through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, to ensure that the quantity and quality of runoff discharged to sensitive areas is not altered in an adverse way when compared with existing conditions. In particular, measures are required to be put in place to avoid discharge of untreated surface runoff from developed and paved areas. The Project incorporates water quality/detention basins, which are designed in accordance with the Riverside County Stormwater Quality Best Management Practice Design Handbook, to treat "first flush" storm water runoff flows and thereby minimize the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials or other elements that might degrade or harm biological resources or ecosystem processes within natural open space areas. Regular maintenance is required pursuant to the Project's WQMP (Appendix G) to ensure effective operations of runoff control systems. The Project's contractor also is required pursuant to

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

County requirements to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to runoff and water quality during construction. Based on the forgoing discussion, the Project would not result in adverse indirect impacts due to drainage. (GLA, 2014, pp. 47-48)

Toxics

Land uses that use chemicals or generate bioproducts such as manure that are potentially toxic or may adversely affect wildlife species, habitat or water quality are required to incorporate measures to ensure that application of such chemicals does not result in discharge to sensitive areas. The proposed Project would be required by the County to implement a SWPPP that will address runoff during construction, and would further be required to implement long-term BMPs to address water quality as a result of development runoff. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 requirements for Toxics. (GLA, 2014, p. 48)

Lighting

Residential uses proposed by the Project would involve the installation of lighting elements associated with streets and residential structures. If such lighting is not directed away from on-site natural open space areas and appropriately shielded, indirect impacts to wildlife species that may be present in these natural habitat areas could occur. An analysis of the Project's potential lighting impacts was previously presented under Issues 3(a) and 3(b). As concluded in the analysis, the Project's mandatory compliance with applicable County ordinances would ensure that potential impacts associated with light trespass would not occur. As such, the Project would be consistent with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 as it pertains to lighting.

Noise

The proposed Project consists of a proposed residential community that is not associated with the generation of substantial amounts of noise. Accordingly, the Project would not result in the generation of noise that could adversely affect sensitive species within open space areas on-site. As such, the Project would be consistent with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 as it pertains to noise.

Invasives

Invasive plant species have the potential to adversely affect natural habitats by outcompeting native species for resources such as nutrients, light, physical space, and water – thereby disturbing the balance of species. Although the Project's preliminary landscape plan does not include any plant species prohibited by Table 6-2 of the MSHCP, there is a potential that such species could be proposed on implementing construction drawings in the future, or planted by residents. This represents a potential conflict with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 for which mitigation would be required. With implementation of Mitigation Measures M-BI-7 and M-BI-8, the Project would fully comply with the invasive plant species requirements of MSHCP Section 6.1.4, and impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Barriers

The Project proposes to provide barriers (fencing/walls) between private residential lots and open space to preclude/discourage trespass into natural open space areas. The County of Riverside reviewed the Project design and determined that appropriate barriers are incorporated into the Project. As such, the Project would be consistent with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 as it pertains to barriers.

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

Grading/Land Development

The MSHCP's Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines preclude manufactured slopes from extending into conservation areas. The Project does not propose to grade or construct manufactured slopes within the on-site natural open space areas. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 as it pertains to grading/development.

Project Compliance with MSHCP Section 6.3.2 "Additional Survey Needs and Procedures"

MSHCP Section 6.3.2 requires special surveys for certain plant species for lands located within the Criteria Area Plant Species Survey Areas (CAPSSA). MSHCP Section 6.3.2 also identifies lands requiring surveys for certain animal species (burrowing owl, mammals, amphibians).

The Project site is within the MSHCP burrowing owl survey area but does not occur within the amphibian or mammal survey areas, or within the CAPSSA. A focused burrowing owl study was conducted on the Project site and an off-site study area by GLA and no burrowing owls were detected (GLA, 2014, p. 54). However, the Project site does contain suitable habitat for burrowing owls and the species has the potential to migrate onto the property. If the species is located on the property prior to when ground-disturbing construction activities occur, a conflict with the MSHCP could occur. This potential conflict is regarded as a significant impact for which mitigation is required. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-BI-9 would reduce potential impacts to the burrowing owl to a level below significant.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing analysis, the Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

b & c) Implementation of the proposed Project has the potential to directly or indirectly impact endangered or threatened plant and animal species, if such species occur within areas planned for impact by the Project.

Biologists from GLA conducted literature research and site-specific biological resource surveys at the Project site from March through December 2012. The information below is based on the survey results documented in the Biological Technical Report attached as Appendix B. Refer to Appendix B for a description of the study methods employed by GLA regarding the general and focused biological resource surveys conducted on the property. Individual plant and animal species evaluated by GLA and reported in Appendix B are based on one or more of the following criteria: a) listing through the Federal and/or State Endangered Species Act (ESA); b) occurrence in the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Rare Plant Inventory (List 1B, 2, 3, or 4); and/or c) evaluation and coverage under the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Animals were considered "special-status" based on one or more of the following criteria: a) listing through the Federal and/or State ESA; b) designation as a Federal Species of Concern; c) designation by the State as a California Species of Special Concern (SSC) or California Fully-Protected Species (CFP); and/or d) evaluation and coverage under the MSHCP.

Impacts to Special-Status Plant Species

No special-status plants were observed on the Project site during field surveys conducted by GLA (GLA, 2014, p. 25). A majority of the site was previously used for agriculture and is regularly disced for fire fuel management, so there is little to no potential that any sensitive plant species could germinate on

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

the property prior to the Project's grading activities. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not impact any special-status plants. No impact would occur.

Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife

Impacts to Listed Species

One listed, special-status species, coastal California gnatcatcher, was observed on the Project site during biological surveys conducted by GLA. Two additional listed, special-status species, Stephens' kangaroo rat (SKR) and least Bell's vireo, were not observed on the Project site but have the potential to occur on-site.

The coastal California gnatcatcher is designated as a MSHCP "Covered Species," and does not require project-specific mitigation. Therefore, the loss of habitat on the Project site for the species is considered less-than-significant because the Project's compliance with the MSHCP (as described in detail under Issue 7(a), above) and the Project's role in the implementation of the MSHCP (via mandatory payment of impact fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810) would ensure the acquisition and maintenance of adequate habitat for this species region-wide. The Project's impact to the coastal California gnatcatcher would be less than significant.

The SKR was not observed on the Project site, but could occur on-site because the subject property contains habitat suitable for the species. As previously discussed under Issue 7(a), above, the Project site is located within the SKR HCP and would be required to pay an impact fee pursuant to Ordinance No. 663 to offset the loss of SKR habitat. With mandatory fee payment, which will be made a condition of Project approval by the County of Riverside, the Project would be consistent with the SKR HCP, and potential impacts to the species would be less than significant.

The least Bell's vireo was not observed on the Project site or within off-site study area. The riparian habitat that would be impacted by the Project is low quality and is not likely to support the least Bell's vireo or be used by the species for nesting. Regardless, because there is the potential for the least Bell's vireo to utilize the Project site, the Project's impacts to the species would be significant and mitigation would be required (see Mitigation Measures M-BI-1 and M-BI-10).

Impacts to Non-Listed Species

Four (4) non-listed, special-status animals were detected during general and focused surveys within the Project's proposed area of impact, including: orangethroat whiptail (covered by MSHCP, hereafter "covered"), Cooper's hawk (nesting, covered), northern harrier (nesting, covered), and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit (covered).

In addition to those species observed onsite, the Project site contains suitable habitat with the potential to support other non-listed special-status animals, including Bell's sage sparrow (covered), burrowing owl (covered), coast horned lizard (covered), coastal whiptail (covered), coast patch-nosed snake (not-covered), ferruginous hawk (wintering, covered), golden eagle (covered), loggerhead shrike (covered), long-eared owl (nesting, not-covered), red-diamond rattlesnake (covered), rosy boa (not covered), northwestern San Diego pocket mouse (covered), San Diego desert woodrat (covered), silvery legless lizard (not covered), Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (covered), western mastiff bat (not covered), western yellow bat (not covered), white-tailed kite (nesting, covered), yellow-breasted chat (covered), yellow warbler (covered), and Yuma myotis (not covered).

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

The Project would comply with the MSHCP (as described in detail under Issue 7(a), above) and would participate in the implementation of the MSHCP (via mandatory payment of impact fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810), thereby providing for adequate conservation of "Covered Species" on a regional level. In addition, the Project would mitigate its impacts to riparian/riverine habitats through the purchase of off-site conservation credits (refer to Mitigation Measure M-BI-1). The Project's compliance with and participation in the MSHCP combined with the implementation of required mitigation would reduce potential direct and cumulative impacts to "Covered Species" to less-than-significant levels. (GLA, 2014, p. 45)

The Project's impact to species that are not "covered" by the MSHCP that were observed or have the potential to occur on the Project site would be less than significant and would not be cumulatively considerable because of the low level of sensitivity of these species, the low quality of habitat on the Project site, and/or limited level of impacts of the proposed Project. (GLA, 2014, p. 45)

Although no nesting migratory birds or burrowing owls were observed on the Project site during field surveys, there is the potential that these species could occupy the Project site prior to the commencement of grading activities. As such, there is a potential that the proposed Project could result in direct and/or indirect impacts to nesting migratory birds and the burrowing owl during construction of the proposed Project. This is a potentially significant impact and mitigation is required (see Mitigation Measures M-BI-9 and M-BI-10).

Conclusion

Implementation of the Project would not impact any special-status plant species but would have the potential to result in significant direct and cumulatively considerable impacts to special-status wildlife species. With the implementation of required mitigation, impacts to special-status wildlife species would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

d) With implementation of the proposed Project, approximately 136.0 acres of the subject property would be converted from vacant, undeveloped property to a master-planned residential community. The remaining approximately 32.3 acres on-site would be conserved as natural open space. The area surrounding the Project site is primarily comprised of agricultural uses and vacant, undeveloped land – both of which are conducive to wildlife movement. As such, implementation of the Project would potentially interfere with the movement of wildlife through the Project area. However, the Project site is not located within or adjacent to areas identified by the MSHCP as a proposed or existing wildlife movement corridor (i.e., habitat linkage or constrained linkage). Because the MSHCP was designed to ensure the establishment and/or preservation of regional wildlife movement corridors, and because the Project site is not located in areas targeted for conservation for such purposes, Project implementation would not interfere substantially with the regional movement of any wildlife species. Additionally, there are no native wildlife nursery sites in close proximity to the Project site. Accordingly, the Project would not result in any impacts to regional wildlife movement corridors or native wildlife nursery sites. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Table 5, *Impacts to Vegetation Communities*, provides a summary of the vegetation communities that would be impacted by the proposed Project, a large majority of which is disturbed non-native grassland. As summarized in Table 5, the Project would impact approximately 136.00 acres of vegetation communities on-site and approximately 1.50 acres of vegetation communities off-site.

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

Table 5 Impacts to Vegetation Communities

Vegetation Community	Grading (On-site)	Grading (Off-site)	Preservation	Total
SCRUB COMMUNITIES				
Riversidian Sage Scrub	0.25	0.39	0.94	1.58
Disturbed/Riversidean Sage Scrub	2.37	0.76	2.41	5.54
<i>Subtotal Scrub Communities</i>	<i>2.62</i>	<i>1.15</i>	<i>3.35</i>	<i>7.12</i>
GRASSLAND COMMUNITIES				
Disturbed Non-Native Grassland	127.24	0.04	26.56	153.84
<i>Subtotal Grassland Communities</i>	<i>127.24</i>	<i>0.04</i>	<i>26.56</i>	<i>153.84</i>
RIPARIAN COMMUNITIES				
Mule Fat Scrub	0.01	0	1.58	1.59
Disturbed/Mule Fat Scrub	0	0	0.55	0.55
Willow Riparian	0	0.19	0.03	0.22
Disturbed Riparian	0.33	0	6.82	7.15
<i>Subtotal Riparian Communities</i>	<i>0.34</i>	<i>0.19</i>	<i>8.98</i>	<i>9.51</i>
DISTURBED COMMUNITIES				
Developed	5.80	0.12	1.33	7.25
<i>Subtotal Disturbed Communities</i>	<i>5.80</i>	<i>0.12</i>	<i>1.33</i>	<i>7.25</i>
TOTAL	136.00	1.50	40.22	177.72

Source: GLA, 2014, Table 5-1

A discussion of Project impacts to each of the vegetation communities located on-site and within the off-site impact areas is provided below:

- **Riversidean Sage Scrub:** The Project would result in direct, permanent impacts to approximately 0.64-acre of Riversidean sage scrub habitat, including 0.25-acre on-site and 0.39-acre off-site. Riversidean sage scrub is addressed through the MSHCP, and the Project site is not identified for conservation by the MSHCP. The Project is consistent with MSHCP (as described in detail under Issue 7(a), above) and would contribute toward the implementation of the MSHCP via mandatory payment of impact fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810 to ensure adequate acquisition of Riversidean sage scrub habitat region-wide. As such, the Project's impacts to Riversidean sage scrub would be less than significant.
- **Disturbed Riversidean Sage Scrub:** The Project would result in direct, permanent impacts to approximately 3.13 acres of disturbed Riversidean sage scrub habitat, including 2.37 acres on-site and 0.76-acre off-site. Riversidean sage scrub is addressed through the MSHCP, and the Project site is not identified for conservation by the MSHCP. The Project is consistent with MSHCP (as described in detail under Issue 7(a), above) and would contribute toward the implementation of the MSHCP via mandatory payment of impact fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810 to ensure adequate acquisition of Riversidean sage scrub habitat region-wide. As such, the Project's impacts to disturbed Riversidean sage scrub would be less than significant.
- **Disturbed Non-Native Grassland:** The Project would result in direct, permanent impacts to approximately 127.28 acres of disturbed non-native grassland, including 127.24 acres on-site and 0.04-acre off-site. Although non-native grassland is not a native habitat, it offers potential foraging habitat for raptors. This vegetation community and adequate conservation of foraging habitat in western Riverside County are addressed by the MSHCP. The Project is consistent

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

with MSHCP (as described in detail under Issue 7(a), above) and would contribute toward the implementation of the MSHCP via mandatory payment of impact fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810 to ensure adequate acquisition of non-native grassland habitat region-wide. As such, the Project's impacts to non-native grassland would be less than significant.

- Mule Fat Scrub: The Project would result in direct, permanent impacts to approximately 0.01-acre of mule fat scrub on-site. Mule fat scrub is a sensitive, natural riparian habitat, and the Project's impacts would be significant prior to mitigation (refer to Mitigation Measure M-BI-1).
- Willow Riparian: The Project would result in direct, permanent impacts to approximately 0.19-acre of willow riparian habitat off-site. Willow riparian is a sensitive, natural riparian habitat, and the Project's impacts would be significant prior to mitigation (refer to Mitigation Measure M-BI-1).
- Disturbed Riparian: The Project would result in direct, permanent impacts to approximately 0.33-acre of disturbed riparian habitat on-site. The Project's impacts to disturbed riparian habitat would be significant prior to mitigation (refer to Mitigation Measure M-BI-1).
- Disturbed/Developed: The Project would result in direct, permanent impacts to approximately 5.92 acres of disturbed/developed habitat, including 5.80 acres on-site and 0.12-acre off-site. Disturbed/developed habitat is not considered a sensitive natural plant community nor does it comprise riparian habitat; therefore, impacts to disturbed/developed habitat would be less than significant.

As noted above, development of the Project would result in significant impacts to approximately 0.01-acre of mule fat scrub, 0.19-acre of willow riparian, and 0.33-acre of disturbed riparian habitat for which mitigation would be required. (GLA, 2014, p. 42) Other than these riparian habitats, there are no other sensitive natural communities on the subject property or in its off-site 1.50-acre off-site disturbance area that would require Project-specific mitigation. With implementation of required mitigation (refer to M-BI-1), impacts to mule fat scrub, willow riparian, and disturbed riparian habitats would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. (GLA, 2014, p. 50)

f) The Project would result in direct, permanent impacts to approximately 0.21-acre of areas under U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) jurisdiction, including 0.19-acre on-site and 0.02-acre off-site. Additionally, the Project would impact 4,451 linear feet of Corps and RWQCB streambed (4,306 feet on-site and 145 feet off-site). None of the Project's impacts to Corp and RWQCB jurisdictional areas would consist of wetlands.

The Project also would result in direct, permanent impacts to 0.66-acre of California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) jurisdiction, of which 0.50-acre consists of vegetated riparian habitat. On-site impacts to CDFW jurisdictional areas would include 0.47-acre, of which 0.31-acre consists of vegetated riparian habitat. Off-site impacts would include 0.19-acre – all of which would consist of vegetated riparian habitat. Additionally, the Project would impact 4,451 linear feet of CDFW streambed (4,306 feet on-site and 145 feet off-site).

The Project's impacts to Corps, RWQCB, and CDFW jurisdictional areas would be significant prior to mitigation. (GLA, 2014, p. 47) With implementation of the required mitigation (refer to Mitigation Measures M-BI-1 and M-BI-11), the Project's impacts to areas under the jurisdiction of the Corps, RWQCB, and CDFW would be less than significant (GLA, 2014, p. 50).

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

g) Aside from the MSHCP (which is addressed above under Issue 7.a), the only local policy/ordinance protecting biological resources within the Project area is the In the Riverside County Oak Tree Management Guidelines, which requires surveys of individual trees and the minimization and/or avoidance of oak trees, where feasible. Based on the results of the site-specific Biological Technical Report (Appendix B), the Project site and off-site impact areas do not contain any oak trees or oak woodland habitat. Accordingly, the proposed Project has no potential to conflict with the County's Oak Tree Management Guidelines, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation:

M-BI-1 (Condition of Approval 60. EPD 004) Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a biologist who holds an MOU with the County of Riverside shall submit documentation that the appropriate acres of mitigation credits have been purchased (2.25 acres) from an approved mitigation bank/in-lieu fee program within the Santa Ana River Watershed as described in the *Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation for Impacts to MSHCP Riparian/Riverine Areas Kraemer Ranch (Tract 36475) Project*, dated July 17, 2014, updated February 26, 2015 (prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc).

M-BI-2 (Condition of Approval 50. EPD 001) Prior to final map recordation, "MSHCP Riparian" and "MSHCP Riverine" areas that are located outside of the Project's "Development Footprint/Fuel Modification Zone," as mapped on Exhibit 8 of the *Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation for Impacts to MSHCP Riparian/Riverine Areas Kraemer Ranch (Tract 36475) Project* dated July 17, 2014, updated February 26, 2015 (prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc.), shall be delineated and labeled as "Delineated Constraint Area (MSHCP Riparian/Riverine)" on the Environmental Constraints Sheet to the satisfaction of the Environmental Programs Division. The Environmental Constraints Sheet map must be stamped by the Riverside County Surveyor with the following notes:

- "No disturbances may occur within the boundaries of the Delineated Constraint Area."
- "Brush management to reduce fuel loads to protect urban uses (fuel modification zones) will not encroach into the Delineated Constraint Area."
- "Night lighting shall be directed away from the Delineated Constraint Area. Shielding shall be incorporated in project designs to ensure ambient lighting in the Delineated Constraint Area is not increased."
- "The Delineated Constraint Area shall be permanently fenced. The fencing shall provide a physical barrier to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal trespass or dumping in the Delineated Constraint Area. The fence shall have a minimum height of three feet at its shortest point. Fence posts shall be no more than five feet apart. The fence design shall be such that a sphere with a diameter of three inches cannot pass through the plane of the fence at any point below the minimum height."

M-BI-3 (Condition of Approval 60. EPD 007) Prior to issuance of a grading permit, "MSHCP Riparian" and "MSHCP Riverine" areas that are located outside of the Project's "Development Footprint/Fuel Modification Zone," as mapped on Exhibit 8 of the *Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation for Impacts to MSHCP*

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

Riparian/Riverine Areas Kraemer Ranch (Tract 36475) Project dated July 17, 2014, updated February 26, 2015 (prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc.), shall be delineated and labeled as "Delineated Constraint Area (MSHCP Riparian/Riverine)" on all applicable grading plan sheets to the satisfaction of the Environmental Programs Division.

M-BI-4 (Condition of Approval 60.EPD 006) Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, "MSHCP Riparian" and "MSHCP Riverine" areas that are located outside of the Project's "Development Footprint/Fuel Modification Zone," as mapped on Exhibit 8 of the *Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation for Impacts to MSHCP Riparian/Riverine Areas Kraemer Ranch (Tract 36475) Project* dated July 17, 2014, updated February 26, 2015 (prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc.), shall be temporarily fenced to avoid impacts during grading and construction. Temporary signs must be posted to clearly indicate that no impacts shall occur within the fenced areas. A report shall be submitted to the Environmental Programs Division by a biologist who has a MOU with the County of Riverside, documenting that the fencing has been completed and encompasses the entirety of the MSHCP Riparian and Riverine areas. The only areas of the MSHCP Riparian and Riverine areas that will not be fenced are those that have been proposed and accounted for in Section 5 "Quantification of Unavoidable Impacts" of the *Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation for Impacts to MSHCP Riparian/Riverine Areas Kraemer Ranch (Tract 36475) Project* dated July 17, 2014, updated February 26, 2015 (prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc.).

M-BI-5 (Condition of Approval 60.EPD 005 and 80.EPD 001) Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a permanent fencing plan shall be submitted to the Environmental Programs Division that provides for the permanent protection of all "MSHCP Riparian" and "MSHCP Riverine" areas that are located outside of the Project's "Development Footprint/Fuel Modification Zone," as mapped on Exhibit 8 of the *Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation for Impacts to MSHCP Riparian/Riverine Areas Kraemer Ranch (Tract 36475) Project* dated July 17, 2014, updated February 26, 2015 (prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc.). The permanent fencing shall provide a physical barrier to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal trespass, or dumping in the delineated riparian area. The fence shall have a minimum height of three feet at its shortest point. Fence posts shall be no more than five feet apart. The fence design shall be such that a sphere with a diameter of three inches cannot pass through the plane of the fence at any point below the minimum height. The permanent fencing shall not be installed prior to Environmental Programs Division review and approval of the permanent fencing plan and must be in place prior to issuance of the first building permit.

M-BI-6 (Condition of Approval 60. EPD 003 and 80. EPD 002) The Project Applicant shall retain a qualified biological monitor to observe grading activities and shall provide the biological monitor with a copy of the grading plan. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the biological monitor shall prepare and submit a biological monitoring work plan to the Environmental Programs Division for approval. The biological monitoring work plan shall specify, but not be limited to, proposed Best Management Practices (BMPs), fencing of sensitive areas, and monitoring reports. The biological monitor must maintain a copy of the grading plans and the grading permit at all times while on the Project site. Prior to issuance of the first building permit, the biological monitor shall provide a final grading

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

monitoring report to the Environmental Programs Division, which may require additional documentation to confirm compliance.

M-BI-7 (Condition of Approval 80. EPD 003) Prior to issuance of building permits or approval of improvement plans, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside County Transportation Department shall review all proposed landscaping elements to verify that none of the prohibited plant species as identified in Table 6-2 of the MSHCP (Section 6.1.4) are included in the plant palette.

M-BI-8 (Condition of Approval 50. Planning 035) The Project's homeowner association covenants, codes, and restrictions (CC&Rs) shall prohibit the planting of the invasive, non-native plant species listed in Table 6-2 of the MSHCP (Section 6.1.4). A copy of the CC&Rs shall be provided to County of Riverside Planning Department staff or its designee to ensure that the provision is included. The homeowners association shall be required to enforce the CC&Rs.

M-BI-9 (Condition of Approval 60. EPD 001) Within 30 days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of the Project's proposed grading footprint and make a determination regarding the presence or absence of the burrowing owl. The determination shall be documented in a report and shall be submitted, reviewed, and accepted by the County of Riverside Environmental Programs Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit and subject to the following provisions:

- a. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies no burrowing owls in the impact area, a grading permit may be issued without restriction.
- b. 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 passively or actively relocate any burrowing owls. The County Biologist shall be consulted to determine the appropriate type of relocation (active or passive) and translocation sites. Passive relocation, including the required use of one-way doors to exclude owls from the site and the collapsing of burrows, will occur if the biologist determines that the proximity and availability of alternate habitat is suitable for successful passive relocation. Passive relocation shall follow CDFW relocation protocol. Active and passive relocation shall only occur outside of the nesting season (March 1 through August 31). If proximate alternate habitat is not present as determined by the biologist, active relocation shall follow CDFW relocation protocol. The biologist shall confirm in writing that the species has fledged the site or been relocated prior to the issuance of a grading permit.
- c. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies the presence of three (3) or more mating pairs of burrowing owl, the requirements of MSCHP Species-Specific Conservation Objectives 5 for the burrowing owl shall be followed. Objective 5 states that if the site (including adjacent areas) supports three (3) or more pairs of burrowing owls and supports greater than 35 acres of suitable Habitat, at least 90 percent of the area with long-term conservation value and burrowing owl pairs will be conserved onsite until it is demonstrated that MSHCP Species-Specific

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

Conservation Objectives 1-4 have been met. Objectives 1-4 are listed in the MSHCP, Volume I, Appendix E. A grading permit shall only be issued, either:

- i. upon approval and implementation of a property-specific Determination of Biologically Superior Preservation (DBESP) report for the western burrowing owl by the CDFW; or
- ii. a determination by the biologist that the site is part of an area supporting less than 35 acres of suitable Habitat, and upon passive or active relocation of the species following accepted CDFW protocols.

M-BI-10

(Condition of Approval 60. EPD 002) Vegetation clearing and ground disturbance shall be prohibited during the bird nesting season (February 1 through August 31), unless a bird nesting survey is completed in accordance with the following requirements:

- a. A nesting bird survey of the Project's grading footprint shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiating vegetation clearing or ground disturbance. If ground disturbance does not begin within 30 days of the report date, a second survey must be conducted.
- b. A copy of the nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the County of Riverside Environmental Programs Department. If the survey identifies the presence of active nests, then the qualified biologist shall provide the Environmental Programs Department with a copy of maps showing the location of all nests and an appropriate buffer zone around each nest sufficient to protect the nest from direct and indirect impact. The size and location of all buffer zones, if required, shall be subject to review and approval by the Environmental Programs Department and shall be no less than a 200-foot radius around the nest for non-raptors and a 500-foot radius around the nest for raptors. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved buffer zone shall be marked in the field with construction fencing, within which no vegetation clearing or ground disturbance shall commence until the qualified biologist and Planning Department verify that the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.

M-BI-11

(Condition of Approval 10 Flood RI 016) Prior to the disturbance of areas subject to the jurisdiction of the ACOE, CDFW, and the RWQCB, and prior to the disturbance of any riparian/riverine areas as so defined in the MSHCP, the Project Applicant shall obtain the necessary authorizations from applicable state and federal regulatory agencies for proposed impacts to jurisdictional waters and riparian/riverine habitats, or the Project Applicant shall provide documentation satisfactory to the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department that no clearances or authorizations are required. If authorizations are required, they would include a Section 404 Permit from the ACOE, Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFW, and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification/ Waste Discharge Requirement from the RWQCB.

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

Monitoring:

- M-BI-1 Prior to final grading inspection, the Riverside County Environmental Programs Division shall verify that the appropriate mitigation credits have been purchased from an approved mitigation bank/in-lieu fee program within the Santa Ana River Watershed as described in the *Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation for Impacts to MSHCP Riparian/Riverine Areas Kraemer Ranch (Tract 36475) Project*, dated July 17, 2014, updated February 26, 2015 (prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc.).
- M-BI-2 Prior to recordation of the final map, evidence shall be provided to the Riverside County Environmental Programs Division that the "Delineated Constraint Area (MSHCP Riparian/Riverine)" is plotted appropriately on the Environmental Constraints Sheet.
- M-BI-3 Prior to grading permit issuance, evidence shall be provided to the Riverside County Environmental Programs Division that the "Delineated Constraint Area (MSHCP Riparian/Riverine)" is plotted appropriately on the grading plan.
- M-BI-4 Prior to issuance of grading permits, evidence shall be provided to the Riverside County Environmental Programs Division that temporary construction and fencing has been installed on the preclude impacts to areas located outside of the Project's "Development Footprint/Fuel Modification Zone."
- M-BI-5 Prior to issuance of grading permits, a permanent fencing plan shall be submitted to the Environmental Programs Division that provides for the permanent protection of areas located outside of the Project's "Development Footprint/Fuel Modification Zone." Prior to issuance of building permits, evidence shall be provided to the Riverside County Environmental Programs Division that the required permanent fencing has been installed.
- M-BI-6 The Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Environmental Programs Division that a qualified biological monitor has been retained to monitor grading activities. The biological monitor shall prepare a pre-construction monitoring program that shall be approved by the Environmental Programs Division prior to the issuance of grading permits and a final monitoring report that is approved by the Environmental Programs Division prior to issuance of building permits.
- M-BI-7 Prior to issuance of building permits or approval of improvement plans, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside County Transportation Department shall ensure that landscaping plans do not contain any of the MSHCP-prohibited plant species.
- M-BI-8 Prior to the first building permit final inspection, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department that the homeowner association CC&Rs prohibit the planting of the invasive, non-native plant species listed in Table 6-2 of the MSHCP within the Project site.
- M-BI-9 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department shall review a report to be provided by the Project applicant documenting

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

the results of the pre-grading burrowing owl survey and shall verify compliance with the recommendations specified therein.

M-BI-10 Prior to the removal of any trees, the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department shall review the results of the preconstruction nesting bird survey (if tree removal activities are proposed during the avian nesting season), and shall verify that all measures specified therein to protect nesting birds are adhered to during grading activities. Alternatively, if no tree removal activities are anticipated during the avian nesting season, then the Environmental Programs Department shall ensure that implementing grading permits are conditioned to prohibit tree removal activities during the nesting season (February 1st through August 31st).

M-BI-11 Prior to the disturbance of areas subject to the jurisdiction of the ACOE, CDFW, and the RWQCB, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department that a Section 404 Permit from the ACOE, Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFW, and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification/Waste Discharge Requirement from the RWQCB have been issued, or the Project Applicant shall provide appropriate documentation that no permits are required by these agencies.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

8. Historic Resources

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

Source: BFSa, 2014; Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a & b) A cultural resources survey of the subject property was conducted by Brian F. Smith & Associates (BFSa). One (1) historic site was identified on the Project site. The historic site, RIV-11,566, was identified as a historic building foundation on the eastern side of the Project site. The foundation consists of poorly mortared and poorly constructed concrete block walls on the downslope sides of the foundation and a partial concrete and dirt floor on the interior of the foundation. It appears the structure that was supported by the foundation was used as a shelter and staging location for the former agricultural operations on the Project site. Based on the maintenance date on the telephone poles surrounding the foundation, the structure's initial usage was estimated to have begun in approximately 1940. No artifacts or historic debris was observed in proximity to the foundation. (BFSa, 2014, p. 4.0-43)

Given the absence of any structural remains, aside from the concrete foundation, and the lack of any artifact deposits in association with the structure, RIV-11,566 has no further research potential, and does not meet the definition of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064. (BFSa, 2014, pp. 4.0-43 - 4.0-46) Accordingly, impacts to historic resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. Archaeological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: BFSAs, 2014; Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a & b) Phase I and Phase II Cultural Resource Assessments were conducted on the Project site by BFSAs, the results of which are contained in Appendix D to this Initial Study. The Phase I and Phase II Cultural Resources Assessment includes the results of a records search, field survey, and significance testing.

Based on the results of the records search and field survey conducted by BFSAs, the Project site contains seven (7) prehistoric sites, each of which were subjected to significance testing in order to evaluate significance pursuant to the significance criteria established by CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. A summary of each prehistoric site is provided below:

- P-33-023013 consists of a metavolcanic biface isolate. Five shovel test pits were excavated at this site; no additional artifacts were encountered. (BFSAs, 2014, pp. 4.0-16 - 4.0.17)
- RIV-11,560 includes a bedrock milling feature, a possible rock enclosure, and a quartz core. A single granary feature for the storage of seeds/grains also was identified. The granary feature is roughly circular and measures approximately 145 centimeters in diameter, has severely deflated over time, and lacks a well-defined structure under existing conditions. Ten shovel tests were conducted, none of which encountered additional cultural resources. (BFSAs, 2014, pp. 4.0-19 - 4.0-20)
- RIV-11,561 occupies an area with large amounts of quartz cobbles, quartz cores, and quartz debitage. This site contains three areas of quartz outcrops, shatter, cores, and debitage, and is characterized as a prehistoric quartz quarry. The quarry is approximately 200 by 120 meters, but the area has been artificially spread by discing and grading over the past several decades. (BFSAs, 2014, p. 4.0-25)
- RIV-11,562 consists of a bedrock milling feature with two milling slicks and a possible rock enclosure. This site is characterized as an isolated milling location containing one bedrock milling feature containing two milling slicks and a possible collapsed rock wall, which has been identified as a potential granary feature. No evidence of any subsurface deposits was identified, and the site appears to have been used sparingly during the prehistoric occupation of this area. (BFSAs, 2014, pp. 4.0-29 - 4.0-31)
- RIV-11,563 was identified as a quartz quarry consisting of quartz shatter and debitage. The prehistoric quarrying activity appears to be associated with a shallow granite outcrop. Repeated

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

discing and clearing of the site area has substantially disturbed the site and scattered most of the archaeological data. The potential for subsurface deposits was explored through the excavation of five shovel tests. No additional resources were encountered. (BFSA, 2014, p. 4.0-34)

- RIV-11,564 consists of a flake scatter and is characterized as a sparse quartz and metavolcanic flake scatter situated on a slope along a ridgeline. The site has been disturbed by past clearing and discing on the subject property, and integrity of the site has been lost. The lithic scatter appears to be associated with a quartz outcrop. Because of the modern impacts to this site, most of the surface scatter of quartz was assumed to be the result of past grading and discing. (BFSA, 2014, p. 4.0-37)
- RIV-11,565 includes quartz debitage in an area of several quartz cobbles. The site area has been disturbed by past clearing on the Project site and continues to be disturbed by soil erosion that is occurring a consequence of the clearing at this location. The results of the field investigations conclude that this site as a remnant of a lithic tool production site. (BFSA, 2014, p. 4.0-40)

Sites RIV-11-560 and RIV-11-565 are not located within the Project's impact footprint and would not be disturbed by the Project.

The remaining archaeological sites on the Project site would be wholly (RIV-11,562, RIV-11,563, RIV-11564, and P-33-023013) or partially (RIV-11,561 and RIV-11566) impacted by the Project; however, none of these sites are an important resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. Although the Project would impact multiple prehistoric sites, the information gathered from the field investigations suggest that the prehistoric use of the Project site and surrounding area was sporadic and reflective of a resource collection and food processing area. Use of the sites for food or lithic procurement was very infrequent based upon the minimal artifact content and the scarcity of milling features. Based upon the data collected, all of the prehistoric sites have reduced integrity due to past agricultural use of the subject property, and have no further research potential. None of the prehistoric sites within Project's impact footprint site meet the definition of an important historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5; therefore, the Project's impacts to known prehistoric sites would be less than significant. (BFSA, 2014, pp. 5.0-1 and 6.0-1)

There is a remote potential that excavation activities conducted on the Project site to uncover archaeological resources during excavation and/or grading activities on the Project site. If significant resources as defined CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 are unearthed, they could be significantly impacted if not appropriately treated. Mitigation Measures M-CR-1 through M-CR-3 are required to mitigate potential impacts to archaeological resources to the maximum extent feasible. Implementation of these measures would ensure that an archaeological monitoring program is implemented during ground disturbing activities, and would ensure that any archaeological resources that may be uncovered are appropriately treated as recommended by a qualified archaeologist. With implementation of the required mitigation, the Project's potential impact to archaeological resources would be reduced to the maximum extent feasible and would be less than significant.

c) The Project site does not contain a cemetery and no known formal cemeteries are located within the immediate site vicinity. Field surveys conducted on the Project site did not identify the presence of any human remains and no human remains are known to exist beneath the surface of the site. Nevertheless, the remote potential exists that human remains may be unearthed during grading and excavation activities associated with Project construction. In the event that human remains are

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

discovered during Project grading or other ground disturbing activities, the Project would be required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq. California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made by the Coroner. If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted and the NAHC must then immediately notify the "most likely descendant(s)" of receiving notification of the discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then make recommendations within 48 hours, and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Mandatory compliance with these requirements would ensure that potential impacts associated with the discovery of human remains would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

d) There are no religious or sacred uses occurring within the Project site or off-site impact areas (BFSA, 2014, p. 3.0-5). Accordingly, no impact to religious or sacred uses would occur.

Mitigation:

M-CR-1 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning 003) Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall retain and enter into a monitoring and mitigation service contract with a qualified Archaeologist and provide a fully executed copy of the contract to the Riverside County Planning Department. The contract shall specify that: The Project Archaeologist (Cultural Resource Professional) shall develop a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan which must be approved by the County Archaeologist prior to issuance of grading permits. The Project Archaeologist shall be included in the pregrade meetings to provide cultural/historical sensitivity training including the establishment of set guidelines for ground disturbance in sensitive areas with the grading contractors and special interest monitors. The Project Archaeologist shall manage and oversee monitoring for all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of each portion of the Project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading, trenching, stockpiling of materials, rock crushing, structure demolition, etc. The Project Archaeologist shall have the 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 special interest monitors.

M-CR-2 (Condition of Approval 60. Planning 002) Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department and the Riverside County Archaeologist that appropriate Native American representative(s) have been invited to monitor initial ground disturbing activities on the Project site and have received or will receive a minimum of two weeks advance notice of ground disturbing activities in previously undisturbed soils. The Native American monitor shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect, or halt ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and recovery of potential archaeological resources. If a Native American monitor is not available, work may continue without the monitor. The Project Archaeologist shall include in the monitoring report any concerns or comments that the Native American monitor has regarding the Project and shall include as an appendix any written correspondence or reports prepared by the monitor. Native American monitoring does not replace any required Cultural Resources

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

monitoring, but rather serves as a supplement for coordination and advisory purposes for all groups' interests only.

M-CR-3

(Condition of Approval 10.Planning 005) If suspected archaeological resources are uncovered on the Project site during ground disturbance activities, the following procedures shall be followed. For purposes of this mitigation measure, an "archaeological resource" is defined as three (3) 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.

- a) All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resource shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the Project Applicant, the Project Archaeologist, the Native American tribal representative (or other appropriate ethnic/cultural group representative), and the Riverside County Planning Director to discuss the significance of the find. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to the appropriate preservation or mitigation measures.
- b) At the meeting, mitigation of the discovered resource(s) shall be discussed. At a minimum, a treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented by the Project Archaeologist to protect the identified archaeological resource(s) from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the archaeological resource(s) in accordance with current professional archaeology standards (typically this sampling level is two (2) to five (5) percent of the volume of the cultural deposit). The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery excavations of archaeological resource(s) of prehistoric origin, and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo laboratory analysis.

M-CR-4

(Condition of Approval 60.Planning 001) Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Riverside County Archaeologist that all archaeological materials recovered during the archaeological investigations have been curated at a Riverside County Curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collection and associated records shall be transferred to the curation facility, including title, and shall be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence of curation shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.

M-CR-5

(Condition of Approval 70.Planning 001) Prior to grading permit final inspection, the Project Archaeologist shall submit an Archaeological 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. The report shall follow the County of Riverside Planning Department Cultural Resources (Archaeological)

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

Investigations Standard Scopes of Work. The County Archaeologist shall review the report to determine adequate compliance.

Monitoring:

- M-CR-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Archaeologist that a qualified professional archaeological monitor has been retained to conduct monitoring of all ground disturbing activities in previously undisturbed soils.
- M-CR-2 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department and the Riverside County Archaeologist that appropriate Native American representative(s) have received advance notification of proposed grading activities on the Project site and shall be allowed to monitor, if they so request.
- M-CR-3 If a significant archaeological resource is uncovered during Project-related ground disturbing activities, the Riverside County Planning Department in consultation with the Project Applicant, Project Archaeologist, and Native American tribal representative shall ensure that an appropriate treatment plan is implemented.
- M-CR-4 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department and Riverside County Archaeologist that a curation agreement has been secured for any important archaeological resources that may be uncovered during Project-related ground disturbing activities.
- M-CR-5 Prior to grading permit final inspection, the Project Archaeologist shall submit the required construction monitoring summary report to the Riverside County Archaeologist.

10. Paleontological Resources

a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?

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

Source: RCLIS, 2014; County of Riverside, 2003a, Figure OS-8.

Findings of Fact: According to Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8, the Project site has a "Low" potential for uncovering paleontological resources. In addition, and partly due to past disturbance associated with agricultural activities, there are no unique geologic features within the Project site boundaries or in the Project's off-site limits of grading. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project				
11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCLIS, 2014; Alta, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a & b) The Project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and is not identified by the Riverside County General Plan as being within a County fault hazard zone. No known earthquake faults underlie the Project site. The nearest mapped, active fault to the Project site, the Elsinore Fault, is located approximately 7.8 miles southwest of the site. (RCLIS, 2014; Alta, 2013, p. 10) Because there are no faults located on the Project site, there is no potential for the Project site to rupture during a seismic event and expose people or structures to adverse effects related to ground rupture.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source: RCLIS, 2014; Alta, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS) does not identify the Project site as having susceptibility to liquefaction (RCLIS, 2014). Seismically-induced liquefaction occurs when dynamic loading of a saturated sand or silt causes pore-water pressures to increase to levels where grain-to-grain contact is lost and material temporarily behaves as a viscous fluid. Liquefaction can cause settlement of the ground surface, settlement and tilting of engineered structures, flotation of buoyant structures, and fissuring of the ground surface. Typically, liquefaction occurs in areas where groundwater occurs in close proximity to the ground surface.

Geologic boring testing was conducted on the Project site by Alta California Geotechnical, Inc. ("Alta"), during which groundwater was not encountered. In light of the relatively deep groundwater at the Project site and the relatively dense nature of the underlying soils and bedrock on-site, the potential for liquefaction and seismically induced ground failure is very low. (Alta, 2013, p. 13) Impacts associated with liquefaction would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

13. Ground-shaking Zone

Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a, Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-12 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk); Alta, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is located in a seismically active area of Southern California and is expected to experience moderate to severe ground shaking during the lifetime of the Project. This risk is not considered substantially different than that of other similar properties in the Southern California area. As a mandatory condition of Project approval, the Project would be required to construct proposed structures in accordance with the California Building Standards Code (CBSC), also known as California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24. The CBSC is designed to ensure that buildings and other structures resist collapse and substantial adverse effects associated with strong seismic ground shaking (Alta, 2013, pp. 12 and 39). Accordingly, with mandatory compliance to the CBSC, ground shaking impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

14. Landslide Risk

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

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

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a, LMWAP Figure 14; Alta, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a) LMWAP Figure 12, *Slope Instability*, does not identify the Project site within an area at risk to landslide or landslide hazards. The Project also was evaluated for geologic hazards, including slope instability and rockfalls, by Alta (refer to Appendix E of this Initial Study). The evaluation determined that the Project site and surrounding areas are generally stable due to underlying dense soils and bedrock and would not be subject to landslide dangers (Alta, 2013, p. 14). Additionally, proposed manufactured slopes would be stable and would not pose a hazard to residents or structures on- or off-site (Alta, 2013, p. 15). Accordingly, the proposed Project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards. Thus, impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

15. Ground Subsidence

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

Source: RCLIS, 2014; Alta, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a) RCLIS does not identify the Project site within an area susceptible to ground subsidence. However, based on a review of on-site soils by Alta, there is a potential for settlement in the artificial fill, alluvium, and colluvium soils on-site resulting from hydro-consolidation (i.e., introduction of water) (Alta, 2013, p. 18). As such, the Project would be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable and could potentially result in ground subsidence. The Project's geotechnical report includes numerous site-specific ground preparation and construction recommendations, including soil removals and compaction, to preclude adverse effects associated with ground subsidence (Alta, 2013, p. 22). The Project would be required to comply with these site-specific grading and construction recommendations contained within the Project's geotechnical report, and the County imposes compliance with the geotechnical report's recommendations as a condition of Project approval. As such, implementation of the Project would result in a less-than-significant impact associated with ground subsidence.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

16. Other Geologic Hazards

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

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a, Figure S-10; Google Earth, 2014; Alta, 2013; On-site Inspection; Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is more than 50 miles from the Pacific Ocean and is not subject to tsunami hazards. The Project site is not located in close proximity to any known active volcanoes. The Project site is located within 1.5 miles of Lake Mathews and 0.3-mile of Harrison Dam; however, due the distance between the Project site and these facilities, there is no risk of seiche at the Project site. Also, the Project is not subject to mud or debris flow. (Alta, 2013, pp. 13-15) In addition, and according to General Plan Figure S-10, the Project site is not located in the dam inundation area of Harrison Dam should a dam failure occur Accordingly, no impact would occur as a result of seiches, mudflows, volcanic hazards, or other geologic hazards not already addressed above or below.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. Slopes				
a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Alta, 2013; Project Application Materials,

Findings of Fact:

a) Implementation of the proposed Project would require grading activities across the majority of the Project site and small areas totaling 1.50 acres off-site. The proposed grading plan would maintain the site's general slope from southeast to northwest. As part of the Project's grading plan, a majority of the property would be graded to create building pads suitable for residential development. The grading operation would result in a modification to the site's existing natural topography. Although the Project would result in a change to the site's existing topography, there would be no adverse effects to the environment resulting from site grading beyond what is already evaluated and disclosed throughout this Initial Study. Accordingly, impacts due to changes to the site's topography and ground surface relief features would be less than significant.

b) All manufactured slopes that would be created as part of the Project's grading operation would be constructed at a maximum slope angle of 2:1. Therefore, there would be no impact resulting from the gradient of manufactured slopes. Several manufactured slopes would be constructed at heights greater than 10 feet (up to a maximum height of 60 feet). The Project's geologist (Alta) evaluated these slopes and determined that the slopes are expected to be grossly stable as designed (Alta, 2013, p. 16 & 33). Accordingly, although the Project would result in the creation of slopes exceeding 10 feet in height, based on the analysis conducted by Alta, such slopes would not result pose any safety risks or result in any adverse impacts to the environment. Therefore, impacts associated with the creation of cut or fill slopes higher than 10 feet in height would be less than significant.

c) The Project site contains two septic system tanks under existing conditions; however, these tanks would be removed during proposed construction activities. The septic system tank would be removed in accordance with Riverside County Department of Public Health requirements. The Project does not propose the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. The Project would install domestic sewer infrastructure and connect to the WMWD's sewer conveyance and treatment system. Accordingly, no impact associated with septic tanks or alternative waste water systems would occur and mitigation is not required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County Municipal Code Chapter 15.12; MDS, 2014a; MDS, 2014b; Alta, 2013; Project Application Materials; On-site Inspection.

Findings of Fact:

a) Implementation of the proposed Project has the potential to result in soil erosion. The analysis below summarizes the likelihood of the Project to result in substantial soil erosion during temporary construction activities and/or long-term operation.

Impact Analysis for Construction-Related Activities

Under existing conditions the Project site is disced as part of routine maintenance activities, which regularly disturbs on-site soils and subjects them to erosion. Proposed grading activities would continue to temporarily expose underlying soils at the Project site, which would increase erosion susceptibility during grading and construction activities. Exposed soils, along with any fill materials being stockpiled on the site for use in the grading operation, would be subject to erosion during rainfall events or high winds due to the removal of stabilizing vegetation and exposure of these erodible materials to wind and water.

Pursuant to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board, the Project Proponent is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for construction activities, including proposed grading and soil stockpiling. The NPDES permit is required for all projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, stockpiling of soil, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one (1) acre of total land area. The County's MS4 NPDES Permit requires the Project Proponent to prepare and submit to the County for approval a Project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would identify a combination of erosion control and sediment control measures (i.e., Best Management Practices) to reduce or eliminate sediment discharge to surface water from storm water and non-storm water discharges during construction. In addition, as described above under the evaluation of Issue 6, *Air Quality*, the Project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403, which would reduce the amount of particulate matter in the air and minimize the potential for wind erosion. With mandatory compliance to the requirements noted in the Project's SWPPP, as well as applicable regulatory requirements, the potential for water and/or wind erosion impacts during Project construction would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

Impact Analysis for Operational Activities

Following construction, wind and water erosion on the Project site would be minimized, as the areas disturbed during construction would be landscaped or covered with impervious surfaces and drainage

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

would be controlled through a storm drain system. Implementation of the Project would result in less long-term erosion and loss of topsoil than occurs under the site's existing conditions.

The County's MS4 NPDES Permit requires the Project Proponent to prepare and submit to the County for approval a Project-specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). The WQMP (refer to Appendix G) identifies an effective combination of erosion control and sediment control measures (i.e., Best Management Practices) to reduce or eliminate discharge to surface water from storm water and non-storm water discharges. The WQMP for the Project requires post-construction measures to ensure on-going erosion protection. Compliance with the WQMP would be required as a condition of Project approval and long-term maintenance of on-site water quality features is required. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in substantial soil erosion during long-term operation. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

Conclusion

Due to the application of Project design features and mandatory compliance with regulatory requirements, the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion during construction or long-term activities.

b) *Note: Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines references Table 18-1-B of the 1994 Uniform Building Code (UBC). This Table no longer exists. The adopted 2001 California Building Code (CBC) included a "Classification of Expansive Soil" that correlated an expansion index with the potential for soil expansion. The subsequent update to the Building Code, the 2007 CBC, contained information on expansive soils, but no longer included a reference to Table 18-1-B. The Building Code currently in effect references ASTM D4829, a standard procedure for testing and evaluating the expansion index (or expansion potential) of soils established by ASTM International, which was formerly known as the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). The analysis presented below is based on the ASTM standard.*

According to the Project's geotechnical report (Appendix E), the expansion potential for on-site soils ranges from "very low" to "low" (Alta, 2013, p. 19). Accordingly, the Project would not create substantial risks to life or property from exposure to expansive soils. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c) No septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems are proposed to be constructed or expanded as part of the Project. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source: MDS, 2014a; MDS, 2014b; Project Application Materials; On-site Inspection

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

Findings of Fact:

a & b) Refer to the analysis under Issue 18(a), above. As previously described, the Project would be required to implement a SWPPP during temporary construction activities and implement Best Management Practices (specified in the Project's WQMP, refer to Appendix G) during long-term operation to preclude substantial soil erosion – both water and wind erosion. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with all regulatory requirements related to erosion (e.g., SCAQMD Rule 403). Because the proposed Project would be required to implement regulatory control measures and design features (i.e., Best Management Practices) to preclude substantial soil erosion during near- and long-term activities, the likelihood of the Project of substantially increasing water erosion on- or off-site, including erosion that may modify the channel of a river, stream, or bed of a lake, would be very low. Accordingly, the Project's erosion-related impacts would be less than significant. Mitigation is not required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

20. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?				

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a, Figure S-8; Ordinance No. 460; Ordinance No. 484; SCAQMD, 2005.

Findings of Fact:

a) Proposed grading activities would expose underlying soils at the Project site, which would increase erosion susceptibility during grading and construction activities. Exposed soils would be subject to erosion due to the removal of stabilizing vegetation and exposure of these erodible materials to wind. Erosion by wind would be highest during periods of high wind speeds.

The Project site is considered to have a “moderate” susceptibility to wind erosion (County of Riverside, 2003a, Figure S-8). During grading and other construction activities involving soil exposure or the transport of earth materials, significant short-term impacts associated with wind erosion would be precluded with mandatory compliance with the Project's SWPPP and Riverside County Ordinance No. 484.2, which establishes requirements for the control of blowing sand. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403, which addresses the reduction of airborne particulate matter with mandatory compliance to these regulatory requirements. With mandatory compliance to regulatory requirements, wind erosion impacts would be less than significant during construction and mitigation is not required.

Following construction, wind erosion on the Project site would be very negligible, as the disturbed areas would be landscaped or covered with impervious surfaces. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not significantly increase the risk of long-term wind erosion on- or off-site, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project

21. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014b

Findings of Fact:

In September 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Climate Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 requires that statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. To reach that goal, AB 32 directed the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop and implement regulations to reduce statewide GHG emissions from stationary sources.

Because AB 32 is the primary plan, policy or regulation adopted in California to reduce GHG emissions, the proposed Project would have a significant impact if it does not comply with the regulations developed under AB 32. A numerical threshold for determining the significance of greenhouse gas emissions in the SCAB has not been established by the SCAQMD for projects where it is not the lead agency. Likewise, the County of Riverside has not adopted a threshold of significance for GHG emissions. As such, a screening threshold of 3,500 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO_{2e}) per year for residential land uses is utilized by Riverside County and standard practice to determine if a residential project has the potential to generate substantial GHG emissions. This threshold is a widely accepted screening threshold used by the County and numerous jurisdictions in the SCAB, and is based on SCAQMD's proposed GHG screening thresholds for non-industrial projects. (Urban Crossroads, 2014b, p. 26) Based on guidance from the SCAQMD, if a residential project would emit less than 3,500 MTCO_{2e} of GHGs per year, the Project is not considered a substantial GHG emitter, and no mitigation or additional analysis required. On the other hand, if a residential project's GHG emissions would exceed 3,500 MTCO_{2e} per year, the project would be considered a substantial source of GHG emissions and further quantitative analysis is required to analyze the project's GHG impacts. (Urban Crossroads, 2014b, p. 27)

Because global warming is the result of GHG emissions, and GHGs are emitted by innumerable sources worldwide, the proposed Project would not result in a direct impact to global warming; rather, Project-related impacts to global climate change only could be significant on a cumulative basis. Therefore, the analysis below focuses on the Project's potential to contribute to GCC in a cumulatively considerable way.

a) GHG emissions associated with the proposed Project primarily would be associated with vehicular traffic during long-term operation. In addition, Project-related construction activities, energy consumption, water consumption, and solid waste generation also would contribute to the Project's overall generation of GHG emissions. The Project's annual GHG emissions, including amortized

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

construction emissions, are summarized in Table 6, *Total Annual Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. The methodology used to calculate the Project's GHG emissions is described in detail in Appendix H.

As shown in Table 6, the Project is estimated to generate approximately 2,971 MTCO₂e annually, which is less than the screening threshold of 3,500 MTCO₂e. As such, the Project would not generate substantial GHG emissions – either directly or indirectly – that would have a significant impact on the environment. Impacts would be less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable and no mitigation is required.

Table 6 Total Annual Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emission Source	Emissions (metric tons per year)			
	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	Total CO ₂ E
Annual construction-related emissions amortized over 30 years	31.94	0.006	--	32.06
Area ^a	43.95	3.62	7.50e-4	44.26
Energy ^b	582.32	0.02	9.08e-3	585.63
Mobile Sources ^c	2,154.82	0.08	--	2,156.43
Waste	40.70	2.41	--	91.21
Water Usage	50.79	0.37	9.17E-3	61.31
Total CO₂E (All Sources)	2,970.90			

Source: CalEEMod™ model output, See Appendix 3.1 for detailed model outputs.

Note: Totals obtained from CalEEMod™ and may not total 100% due to rounding.

Table results include scientific notation. *e* is used to represent times ten raised to the power of (which would be written as x 10^{en}) and is followed by the value of the exponent

^a Includes emissions of landscape maintenance equipment and architectural coatings emissions

^b Includes emissions of natural gas consumption

^c Includes emissions of vehicle emissions and fugitive dust related to vehicular travel

Source: (Urban Crossroads, 2014b, Table 3-1)

b) AB 32 is the State of California's primary GHG emissions regulation. The SCAQMD GHG significance threshold was designed to ensure compliance with AB 32 emissions reductions requirements in the SCAB. Therefore, if a proposed project emits below the significance threshold it can be assumed to comply with AB 32 within the SCAQMD's jurisdiction. As the Project would emit less than 3,500 MTCO₂e per year, the Project would not conflict with the state's ability to achieve the reduction targets defined in AB 32 (refer to response to Issue 21(a), above).

The Project would also comply with a number of regulations that would further reduce GHG emissions, including the following regulations that are particularly applicable to the Project and that would assist in the reduction of GHG emissions:

- Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB32)
- Regional GHG Emissions Reduction Targets/Sustainable Communities Strategies (SB 375)
- Pavely Fuel Efficiency Standards (AB1493). Establishes fuel efficiency ratings for new vehicles.

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

- Title 24 California Code of Regulations (California Building Code). Establishes energy efficiency requirements for new construction. Title 24 will become even more stringent beginning January 1, 2014.
- Title 20 California Code of Regulations (Appliance Energy Efficiency Standards). Establishes energy efficiency requirements for appliances.
- Title 17 California Code of Regulations (Low Carbon Fuel Standard). Requires carbon content of fuel sold in California to be 10% less by 2020.
- California Water Conservation in Landscaping Act of 2006 (AB1881). Requires local agencies to adopt the Department of Water Resources updated Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance or equivalent to ensure efficient landscapes in new development and reduced water waste in existing landscapes.
- Statewide Retail Provider Emissions Performance Standards (SB 1368). Requires energy generators to achieve performance standards for GHG emissions.
- Renewable Portfolio Standards (SB 1078). Requires electric corporations to increase the amount of energy obtained from eligible renewable energy resources to 20 percent by 2010 and 33 percent by 2020.

There are no other plans, policies, or regulations that have been adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs that are applicable to the proposed Project.

As such, the proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, and impacts would be less-than-significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

22. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

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

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

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a, Safety Element, LMWAP; GeoKinetics, 2013a; GeoKinetics, 2013b; Project Application Materials,

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or environment based on existing site conditions, construction activities, and long-term operation. Each is discussed below.

Impact Analysis for Existing Conditions

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was conducted for the property by GeoKinetics to determine if any recognized environmental conditions exist on the Project site. Refer to Appendix I for a detailed description of the subject property's existing conditions. As part of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, GeoKinetics interviewed the Project site's property owner, who indicated that small amounts of pesticides were used on site in conjunction with past agricultural activities (GeoKinetics, 2013a, p. 7). To evaluate the potential for pesticides to persist on the Project site, GeoKinetics collected and analyzed 14 soil samples from the Project site for the presence of organochlorinated pesticides and chlorinated herbicides. Low levels of pesticides were detected in six (6) of the 14 samples; however, the pesticides were detected at a magnitude lower than the federal and State Preliminary Remedial Goals (PRGs) and do not pose a substantial safety hazard.

The Project site also contains the following features with the potential to be hazardous (GeoKinetics, 2013a, pp. 4-6):

- An approximately 1,500 s.f. storage barn located in the east central edge of the site. The barn, which was built in the early 1960s, consists of a concrete slab floor, corrugated steel walls and roof, steel beam studs and structural members, and wood partitions. No fluorescent lights were observed in the barn.
- An approximately 48 s.f. concrete slab located to the west of the storage barn. The structure – thought to be a fertilizer storage shed – appears to have been destroyed in a fire.
- Two (2) block foundations located in the southeastern portion of the Project site. The foundations previously supported mobile homes. Plumbing piping – including septic system tanks and leach lines – and other residential utility lines are present near the block foundations.
- Eight (8) power poles are located in the southwestern portion of the Project site. Only one power pole is equipped with a transformer; no leaks were observed from the transformer.
- Irrigation standpipes, associated with former agricultural operations, were observed in several locations across the Project site.
- Spent shotgun shell casings and discarded televisions debris were observed in several areas across the Project site.

No evidence of underground vaults, above-ground storage tanks (ASTs), drums, or water wells were observed on the Project site (GeoKinetics, 2013a, p. 6).

With the exception of the barn and the septic system tanks (which are discussed below in more detail), GeoKinetics determined that the existing features on the Project site have no potential to pose a substantial environmental hazard.

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

The barn was built in an era (pre-1978) when the use of asbestos containing materials (ACM, a known carcinogen) and lead paint (a known toxic) was common in building construction. The barn is constructed mostly of steel, but does contain some building materials that may contain ACMs and/or lead paint. Therefore, the demolition of this structure could expose construction workers and nearby sensitive receptors to a substantial safety hazard during clearing of the site during the Project's construction stage.

Asbestos is a carcinogen and is categorized as a hazardous air pollutant by the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Federal asbestos requirements are found in National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) within the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 40, Part 61, Subpart M, and are enforced in the Project area by the SCAQMD. In conformance with the NESHAP, SCAQMD Rule 1403 establishes survey requirements, notification, and work practice requirements to prevent asbestos emissions from emanating during building renovation and demolition activities. Assuming that ACMs are present in the existing construction debris, subsurface concrete irrigation lines, and structures located on the property, then Rule 1403 requires notification of the SCAQMD prior to commencing any demolition or renovation activities. Rule 1403 also sets forth specific procedures for the removal of asbestos, and requires that an on-site representative trained in the requirements of Rule 1403 be present during the stripping, removing, handling, or disturbing of ACM. Mandatory compliance with the provisions of Rule 1403 would ensure that construction-related grading, clearing and demolition activities do not expose construction workers or nearby sensitive receptors to significant health risks associated with ACMs. Because the Project would be required to comply with AQMD Rule 1403 during demolition activities, impacts due to asbestos would be less than significant.

Lead paint is regulated by Title 17, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Division 1, Chapter 8: Accreditation, Certification and Work Practices for Lead-Based Paint and Lead Hazards. During clearing of the existing on-site construction debris and demolition of the existing barn, there is a potential for exposing construction workers to health hazards associated with lead. The Project would be required to comply with Title 17, CCR, Division 1, Chapter 8, which includes requirements such as employer provided training, air monitoring, protective clothing, respirators, and hand washing facilities. Mandatory compliance with these mandatory requirements would ensure that construction workers are not exposed to significant lead paint health hazards during demolition, and would reduce impacts to a level below significant.

The Project site contains several existing septic systems that would be removed during construction of the Project. The existing septic systems are required to be removed, handled, and disposed in accordance with all applicable local (i.e., Riverside County Department of Environmental Health) and State regulations. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not expose the public or the environment to significant hazards associated with the removal and disposal of on-site septic systems. Impacts would be less-than-significant.

Impact Analysis Related to Project Construction Activity

Heavy equipment (e.g., dozers, excavators, tractors) would be operated on the subject property during construction of the Project. This heavy equipment would likely be fueled and maintained by petroleum-based substances such as diesel fuel, gasoline, oil, and hydraulic fluid, which is considered hazardous if improperly stored or handled. In addition, materials such as paints, adhesives, solvents, and other substances typically used in building construction would be located on the Project site during construction. Improper use, storage, or transportation of hazardous materials can result in accidental releases or spills, potentially posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment. This is a

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

standard risk on all construction sites, and there would be no greater risk for improper handling, transportation, or spills associated with the proposed Project than would occur on any other similar construction site. Construction contractors would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding the transport, use, and storage of hazardous construction-related materials, including but not limited requirements imposed by the EPA, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), SCAQMD and Santa Ana RWQCB. Because compliance with these regulatory requirements by construction contractors is mandatory, impacts due to hazardous materials used, transported, and/or stored during construction would be less than significant.

Impact Analysis for Long-Term Operational Activities

The Project site would be primarily developed with residential land uses and supporting recreational and open space land uses, which are land uses not typically associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Although residential land uses may utilize household products that contain toxic substances, such as cleansers, paints, adhesives, and solvents, these products are usually in low concentration and small in amount and would not pose a significant risk to humans or the environment during transport to/from or use at the Project site. Pursuant to State law and local regulations, residents would be required to dispose of household hazardous waste (e.g., batteries, used oil, old paint) at a permitted household hazardous waste collection facility. Accordingly, the Project would not expose people or the environment to significant hazards associated with the disposal of hazardous materials at the Project site. Long-term operation of the Project would not expose the public or the environment to significant hazards associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and impacts would be less than significant.

Conclusion

With mandatory compliance with the federal, state, and local hazardous materials regulations described above, the Project site would not contain any recognized environmental conditions. As such, neither construction nor operation of the Project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

b) Accidents involving hazardous materials that could pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment would be highly unlikely during the construction and long-term operation of the Project and are not reasonably foreseeable. As discussed above under Issue 22(a), the transport, use and handling of hazardous materials on the Project site during construction is a standard risk on all construction sites, and there would be no greater risk for upset and accidents than would occur on any other similar construction site. Upon buildout, the Project site would operate as a residential community, which is a land use type not typically associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials that could be subject to upset or accident involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Accordingly, impacts associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials would be less than significant during both construction and long-term operation of the Project.

c) The Project site does not contain any emergency facilities nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route. Under long-term operational conditions, the proposed Project would maintain adequate roadway access for emergency vehicles on-site as required by Riverside County. The Riverside County Fire Department reviewed proposed TR 36475 and determined that the tract map design provides for adequate emergency access. Furthermore, based on the Project's traffic report

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

(Appendix K), the Project would not result in a substantial alteration to the design or capacity of any existing public road that would impair or interfere with the implementation of evacuation procedures. Because the Project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, no impact would occur.

d) The Project site is not located within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would have no potential to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. No impact would occur.

e) The Project site is listed on two (2) hazardous materials databases due to an underground unleaded fuel storage tank previously located on the Project site (GeoKinetics, 2013a, p. 14). However, the storage tank was removed from the Project site under permit from the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health in 1995. The storage tank was undamaged at the time of removal, and soil samples taken at the time the tank was removed did not detect hydrocarbons (GeoKinetics, 2013a, p. 5). Refer to Appendix I for more information related to the underground storage tank removal. Accordingly, the Project does not pose a hazard to the public or environment related to the underground storage tank that was previously located on the Project site. The Project site does not appear on any other hazardous materials database. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source: (County of Riverside, 2003a, Figure S-19); (RCLIS, 2014); Google Earth (accessed August 25, 2014).

Findings of Fact:

a) through d) The nearest airport to the Project site is the Riverside Municipal Airport, which is a public use airport located approximately 5.2 miles north of the Project site. There are no active private airstrips or heliports in the vicinity of the Project site. A small, private airstrip is located approximately one (1) mile south of the Project site (north of Lake Mathews); however, based on aerial photographs from Google Earth, this airstrip has not been operational since at least 2011 – a large yellow “X” is painted

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

at the beginning of the runway (a universal aviation symbol for a runway closed to all operations) and the runway is covered in dirt and used as a construction materials staging area. According to RCLIS, the Project site is not located within the Influence Area of any airport and, therefore, does not require review by the Airport Land Use Commission. Accordingly, the Project has no potential to expose future residents in the Project area to airport-related safety hazards. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

24. Hazardous Fire Area

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

a) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Source: RCLIS, 2014; Firesafe, 2014.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is located within a high fire hazard area; therefore, a fuel modification program, consistent with County requirements, is required to protect future residents from wildland fire hazards. A fuel modification plan accompanies proposed TR 36475 to establish requirements for allowable, fire-resistant plant materials, plant spacing, irrigation, and maintenance (i.e., thinning) at locations where development on the Project site would interface with areas of natural vegetation. The proposed fuel modification plan has been approved by the Riverside County Fire Department and is included as Appendix L to this Initial Study. Compliance with the fuel modification plan would be made a condition of Project approval. Mandatory compliance with the fuel modification plan would ensure that Project residents are not exposed to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project

25. Water Quality Impacts

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

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

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

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
d) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 and odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: FEMA, 2008; RCLIS, 2014; WMWD, 2014a; MDS, 2014a; MDS, 2014b; Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) As detailed in the Project's hydrology technical report prepared by MDS Consulting (refer to Appendix F), the Project site accepts storm water runoff flows from an approximately 78.8-acre tributary area east of the subject property under existing conditions. Off-site storm water flows are conveyed through the Project site by natural drainage courses; these natural drainage courses also capture storm water runoff originating on-site. The storm stormwater runoff flows are directed west and north through the Project site where they are carried toward the Harrison Dam by natural drainage courses. The Harrison Dam, located approximately 0.3-mile north of the Project site, is an earthen fill dam owned and operated by the Riverside County Flood Control and Conservation District. The Harrison Dam temporarily stores storm water runoff flows during peak storm events before discharging flows to natural drainage courses to the north.

The proposed Project is designed to preserve the natural drainage courses the traverse the subject property in open space areas. As previously described under the responses to Issue 7, *Biological Resources*, the Project would result in minor physical disturbances to natural drainage courses that traverse the Project site but would not adversely affect the function (drainage patterns or flooding conditions) of these drainage areas. Storm water flows originating from off-site areas would be conveyed via on-site natural drainage courses and culverts (at roadway crossings) consistent with historic drainage flow patterns. Storm water runoff from developed portions of the Project site 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 two proposed water quality/detention basins on-site for water quality treatment. From the water quality treatment facilities, storm water flows would either infiltrate into the ground or be discharged in close proximity to historic flow locations 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

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

(including silt and sediment). The natural drainage courses in the north-central and northwest portions of the property that receive storm water runoff flows from developed portions of the Project site (either directly or via the water quality/detention basins) would discharge in close proximity to historic flow locations and natural drainage courses would then carry runoff to the Harrison Dam. With construction of the proposed storm water drainage system, the proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the subject property in any way that could result in substantial on- or off-site erosion. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b) The California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Section 13000 ("Water Quality") et seq., of the California Water Code), and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendment of 1972 (also referred to as the Clean Water Act (CWA)) require that comprehensive water quality control plans be developed for all waters within the State of California. The Project site is located within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana RWQCB. Water quality information for the Santa Ana River is contained in the Santa Ana RWQCB's Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Plan (updated February 2008) and the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) for the Santa Ana River Watershed (also referred to as "One Water One Watershed," dated November 16, 2010), prepared by the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority. These documents are herein incorporated by reference and are available for public review at the Santa Ana RWQCB office located at 3737 Main Street, Suite 500, Riverside, CA 92501.

The CWA requires all states to conduct water quality assessments of their water resources to identify water bodies that do not meet water quality standards. Water bodies that do not meet water quality standards are placed on a list of impaired waters pursuant to the requirements of Section 303(d) of the CWA. The Project site resides within the Santa Ana River Watershed, Region 8. Receiving waters for the property's drainage are the Temescal Creek Channel, Santa Ana River Reaches 3, 2, and 1, and the tidal prism of the Santa Ana River and Newport Slough which discharges into the Pacific Ocean. The Santa Ana River Reach 3 is 303(d) impaired by copper, pathogens, and lead and Reach 2 is impaired by indicator bacteria. The tidal prism of the Santa Ana River and Newport Slough is impaired by pathogens. (MDS, 2014b, p. 8)

A specific provision of the CWA applicable to the proposed Project is CWA Section 402, which authorizes the NPDES permit program that covers point sources of pollution discharging to a water body. The NPDES program also requires operators of construction sites one acre or larger to prepare a SWPPP and obtain authorization to discharge stormwater under an NPDES construction stormwater permit.

Impact Analysis for Construction-Related Water Quality

Construction activities associated with the proposed Project would temporarily generate potential water quality pollutants such as silt and debris and introduce materials on the property such as chemicals, paints, and other solvents with the potential to adversely affect water quality. As such, short-term water quality impacts have the potential to occur during construction of the Project in the absence of any protective or avoidance measures.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Santa Ana RWQCB and the County of Riverside, the Project would be required to obtain a NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit for construction activities. The NPDES permit is required for all projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, soil stockpiling, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with the Santa Ana RWQCB's Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control

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

Program. Compliance with the NPDES permit and the Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program involves the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP for construction-related activities, including grading and soil stockpiling. The SWPPP shall specify the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that the Project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are prevented, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property. Mandatory compliance with the SWPPP will ensure that the proposed Project does not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction activities. Therefore, water quality impacts associated with construction activities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

Impact Analysis for Post-Development Water Quality

Storm water pollutants commonly associated with the land uses proposed by the Project (i.e., residential, park, open space) include sediment/turbidity, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen-demanding substances, organic compounds, bacteria and viruses, oil and grease, pesticides, and metals. Based on current receiving water impairments and allowable discharge requirements, the Project's pollutants of concern are pathogens (bacteria and viruses) and nutrients/low dissolved oxygen (MDS, 2014b, p. 9). To meet NPDES requirements, the proposed storm drain system is designed to route first flush water runoff (85th percentile) to water quality/detention basins on-site prior to discharging off-site. The proposed basins are sized to treat the entire Project's first flush volumes (MDS, 2014b, p. 18).

Furthermore, the Project would be required to implement a WQMP, pursuant to the requirements of the County's NPDES permit. The WQMP is a post-construction management program that ensures the ongoing protection of the watershed basin by requiring structural and programmatic controls. The Project's WQMP is included as Appendix G. The WQMP identifies structural controls (including a water quality/detention basin) and programmatic controls (including educational materials for property owners, common area litter control, etc.) to minimize, prevent, and/or otherwise appropriately treat storm water runoff flows before they are discharged from the site. Mandatory compliance with the WQMP would ensure that the Project does not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during long-term operation. Therefore, water quality impacts associated with post-development activities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

Due to the implementation of design features and mandatory compliance with applicable regulatory requirements, the proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction or long-term operation. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation is required.

c) No potable groundwater wells are proposed as part of the Project; therefore, the Project would not deplete groundwater supplies through direct extraction. The proposed Project would increase impervious surface coverage on the site, which would in turn reduce the amount of direct infiltration of runoff into the ground. However, the Project's storm water runoff is engineered to be conveyed through developed portions of the Project site and discharged into natural open space areas where groundwater recharge would still occur. Furthermore, the Project site is not underlain by a groundwater basin and the construction of impervious surfaces on the Project site is not expected to substantially alter groundwater levels (WMWD, 2010, Figure 3-1). Therefore, impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

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

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

e & f) The Project site is located within FEMA Flood Zone "X," which corresponds with areas of minimal flood hazard (less than 0.2-percent annual chance of flood) (FEMA, 2008). Accordingly, the proposed Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, nor would the Project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. No impact would occur.

g) There are no conditions associated with the proposed Project that could result in the substantial degradation of water quality beyond what is described above in the responses to Issues 25(a), 25(b), and 25(d). No impact would occur.

h) The Project's proposed water quality/detention basins are designed to treat runoff from the Project site prior to discharging flows towards downstream areas. Storm 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 36475 (refer to Appendix G) and required by County conditions of approval would preclude any potentially adverse conditions. Accordingly, the Project would not include any new or retrofitted stormwater BMPs that could result in significant environmental effects, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones," Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone"; MDS, 2014a.

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

Findings of Fact:

a & b) As detailed in the Project's hydrology technical report prepared by MDS Consulting (refer to Appendix G), the Project site accepts storm water runoff flows from an approximately 78.8-acre tributary area east of the subject property under existing conditions. Off-site storm water flows are conveyed through the Project site by natural drainage courses; these natural drainage courses also capture storm water runoff originating on-site. The storm stormwater runoff flows are directed west and north through the Project site where they are carried toward the Harrison Dam by natural drainage courses. The Harrison Dam, located approximately 0.3-mile north of the Project site, is an earthen fill dam owned and operated by the Riverside County Flood Control and Conservation District. The Harrison Dam temporarily stores storm water runoff flows during peak storm events before discharging flows to natural drainage courses to the north.

The proposed Project is designed to preserve the natural drainage courses the traverse the subject property in open space areas. As previously described under the responses to Issue 7, *Biological Resources*, the Project would result in minor physical disturbances to natural drainage courses that traverse the Project site but would not adversely affect the function (drainage patterns or flooding conditions) of these drainage areas. Storm water flows originating from off-site areas would be conveyed via on-site natural drainage courses and culverts (at roadway crossings) consistent with historic drainage flow patterns. Storm water runoff from developed portions of the Project site 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 two proposed water quality/detention basins on-site for water quality treatment. From the water quality treatment facilities, storm water flows would either infiltrate into the ground or be discharged in close proximity to historic flow locations 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. The natural drainage courses that receive storm water runoff flows from developed portions of the Project site (either directly or via the water quality/detention basins) would be discharged from the north-central and northwest portions of the property – in close proximity to historic flow locations – into natural drainage courses that would carry runoff to the Harrison Dam.

Extended detention basins are not required on the Project site to attenuate runoff flows originating from developed areas on-site to pre-development levels due to the close proximity of the property to the Harrison Dam (MDS, 2014a, p. 1). Detention basins would delay the discharge of storm water flows to the Harrison Dam during peak storm events. If detention were proposed, storm water flows would be discharged into the Harrison Dam closer to the peak flow rate of the Dam and downstream areas, thereby potentially exposing areas downstream of the Project site to an increased risk of flooding.

Therefore, with construction of the proposed storm water drainage system, the proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Project site or change absorption rates in any way that could result in flooding on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

c) According to LMWAP Figure 10, *Flood Hazards*, the Project site is not located within areas subject to dam inundation hazards. There are no levees within the Project vicinity that could expose the Project site to flood hazards. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

d) As discussed above in the responses to Items 26(a) and (b), implementation of the proposed Project would not substantially alter the historical drainage patterns of the Project site. Because the

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

Project would not substantially alter the drainage characteristics of the Project site, Project implementation would not result in substantial changes in the amount of surface water in any downstream water body. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

LAND USE/PLANNING	Would the project				
27. Land Use		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCLIS, 2014; City of Riverside, 2007, Land Use/Urban Design Element; Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) Under existing conditions, the Project site is undeveloped. Although the change from undeveloped land to a master-planned residential community represents a change to the site's present use, environmental impacts associated with such conversion are evaluated throughout this Initial Study and mitigation measures are imposed where necessary to reduce potentially significant impacts to below a level of significance. Accordingly, impacts associated with the conversion of the present land use of the Project site would be less than significant.

The Riverside County General Plan designates the Project site for residential land uses (RC-EDR and RC-VLDR). If the Project site were developed in accordance with its existing General Plan and LMWAP land use designations, a maximum of 157 single-family dwelling units could be constructed on the subject property on minimum lot sizes ranging from one (1) to two (2) acres. The proposed Project includes a General Plan Amendment to change the subject property's General Plan and LMWAP land use designation to RC-LDR to accommodate development of the site with 171 single-family dwelling units with lots sizes ranging from 13,946 square feet to approximately 2.6 acres. The lot sizes proposed by the Project are consistent with the clustering provisions in the County General Plan and the LMWAP. Clustering allows for the provision of natural open space areas by concentrating development on a smaller portion of the property. Although the Project would increase the development intensity on the subject property, the increase would be minor (from 0.93 dwelling units per acre to 1.03 dwelling units per acre) and the residential land uses proposed by the Project would be of similar character as residential land uses to the northeast, east, and west of the Project site. Furthermore, environmental effects associated with the proposed increase in density on the subject property are evaluated throughout this Initial Study and mitigation measures are imposed where necessary to reduce potentially significant impacts to below a level of significance. Accordingly, the Project would not result in a substantial alteration of the planned land use of the subject property and impacts would be less than significant.

b) The Project site is located within the City of Riverside Sphere of Influence. According to Figure LU-10 of the City of Riverside General Plan, the Project site is pre-zoned by the City for "Agricultural (A, maximum 0.2 du/ac)" land uses. The Project Applicant proposes to develop the site with residential

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

land uses at a density of 1.03 dwelling unit per acre; therefore implementation of the Project would not be consistent with City of Riverside's pre-zone designation. Inconsistency with a pre-zone designation is not a physical environmental effect. The Project site abuts property to the north that is approved by Riverside County as a master-planned residential community with residential densities up to 5.0 du/ac (Specific Plan No. 325A1, Citrus Heights). The proposed Project would serve as a transition between planned and approved "Medium" density residential land uses to the north and lower density uses planned to the south by the City of Riverside General Plan. Additionally, the Project would not conflict with the City of Riverside's pre-zoning designation to the east (Very Low Density Residential) because the density would be similar to the Project. The Project also would not conflict with the City of Riverside's pre-zoning designation to the south and west (Agricultural) because residential land uses on the Project site would be buffered from planned agricultural areas by open space area that is proposed to be conserved in the southern and western portions of the Project site and because the Project would be required to comply with Ordinance No. 625 (Right to Farm). Based on the foregoing analysis, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
28. Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Ordinance No. 625,1986; County of Riverside, 2003a, LMWAP; RCLIS, 2014; Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) Under existing conditions, the Project site is zoned "Light Agriculture, 10-acre minimum lot size (A-1-10)." The proposed Project includes a Change of Zone request that would convert the subject property's zoning designation to "One Family Dwellings, minimum 7,200 square foot lot sizes (R-1)." The proposed R-1 zoning designation would be consistent with and implement the Project site's proposed General Plan and LMWAP land use designation (RC-LDR). Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b) Zoning designations surrounding the Project site include the following: "Specific Plan (SP)" to the north, "Residential Agricultural (R-A)" to the northeast, "A-1-10" and "Residential Agricultural, 5-acre minimum lot size (R-A-5)" to the east, and A-1-10 to the south and west. Areas within the SP zone to the north are identified for development with low and medium density residential and ancillary land uses as part of the Citrus Heights Specific Plan (SP 325A1). The proposed Project, which consists of low

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

density residential land uses, would be fully compatible with zoning applied to the Citrus Heights property to the north. Lands to the northeast and east are zoned R-A and R-A-5, which allow for single-family development on minimum 20,000 square foot and five (5)-acre lots, respectively, with limited agricultural uses. The Project proposes residential lots sizes from 13,946 square feet to approximately 2.6 acres, which would be compatible with residential land uses allowed by the R-A and R-A-5 zones. Although there is the potential for residential development on the Project site to result in an incompatibility with agricultural uses that could occur within the R-A and R-A-5 zones, the proposed Project would be required to comply with the County's "Right to Farm" ordinance (Ordinance No. 625) to preclude any potential land use inconsistencies between residential and agricultural land uses. Mandatory compliance with Ordinance No. 625 also would preclude an inconsistency with properties zoned A-1-10 to the east, south and west of the Project site. Accordingly, the Project would be compatible with existing surrounding zoning and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

c) Existing land uses surrounding the Project site include undeveloped land to the north that is approved for development as a master-planned residential community (Citrus Heights Specific Plan); low density residential land uses to the northeast, undeveloped land and rural residential land uses to the east, and undeveloped land to the south and west. The Project proposes residential, recreation, and open space land uses of similar character as existing, surrounding land uses. Accordingly, the Project would be compatible with existing, surrounding land uses.

Existing land use designations surrounding the Project site include: "LDR," "Medium Density Residential (MDR)," "Recreation (R)" (pursuant to Specific Plan No. 325A1) to the north; "Conservation (C)" to the northwest; "EDR" and "VLDR" to the east; and "VLDR" and "LDR" to the south and west. The land uses proposed by the Project would be compatible with the planned land uses in the surrounding area, as the majority of the surrounding area is planned for long-term development with residential development at densities similar to the Project. Also, the Project would not conflict with the planned "Conservation" land uses to the northwest of the Project site because the Project proposes to preserve land along its western boundary as open space.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the proposed Project would be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses, and impacts would be less than significant.

d) The Project site is not located within the boundaries of any Specific Plan. The Project includes a request for a General Plan Amendment to modify the subject property's land use designations from "RC-EDR" and "RC-VLDR" to "RC-LDR." Upon approval of GPA 1132, the Project would be consistent with the land use designations the General Plan and LMWAP.

The proposed Project is located within the LMWAP's El Sobrante Policy Area. The purpose of the El Sobrante Policy Area is to address the infrastructure capacity within the policy area with an emphasis on preservation of the area's rural lifestyle. The Project's consistency with the El Sobrante Policy Area policies is discussed below. In order for a policy inconsistency to be significant under CEQA, the inconsistency must result in a significant environmental effect.

LMWAP 1.1: Require the provision of adequate and available infrastructure to support development. To sustain the rural lifestyle found within the area, while still providing an acceptable level of service on local roadways, the total number of dwelling units within the Policy Area shall not exceed an additional 1,500 dwelling units. The circulation system, which would support the development of these additional dwelling units and which would, in part, be funded by their

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

development, includes the following roadway improvements: the McAllister Street/ Dufferin Avenue Loop and the construction of a new connection ("A" Street) between McAllister Street/Dufferin Avenue Loop and Van Buren Boulevard, south of Dufferin Avenue. In addition to these improvements, other circulation connections between the Policy Area and the adjacent City of Riverside would be closed. These closures would direct high traffic volumes away from rural residential and green belt streets and toward more appropriate thoroughfares. Limiting the number of dwelling units within the Policy Area will help to maintain acceptable levels of service on local roadways both within the County and adjacent green belt areas of the City of Riverside. Limiting the number of dwelling units will also contribute to the continuation of the rural lifestyle enjoyed by area residents.

The Project would develop the subject property at a density of 1.03 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with a rural lifestyle. In addition, the proposed Project would not cause the 1,500 unit allotment within the El Sobrante Policy Area to be exceeded, and additional dwelling units would remain available for development in the Policy Area. The Project also would not substantially degrade the level of service on local roads within the County or adjacent green belt areas of the City of Riverside after mitigation (refer to response to Issue 43(a), below). Additionally, the Project would contribute funds to the construction of Street "A," which is a major infrastructure improvement specifically called for by LMWAP 1.1. Based on the foregoing analysis, the Project would be consistent with LMWAP 1.1.

LMWAP 1.2 Within the area depicted as Medium Density Residential, overall density shall not exceed three (3) dwelling units per acre.

LMWAP 1.2 does not apply to the Project because the Project site is not designated by the General Plan Land Use Element or LMWAP for "Medium Density Residential" land uses.

LMWAP 1.3 Coordinate with local agencies to ensure adequate service provision for all development within the Policy Area.

The proposed Project would be developed in coordination with local service providers and, therefore, would be consistent with LMWAP 1.3 (refer to the analysis under the *Public Services and Utilities and Service Systems* issue areas, below).

LMWAP 1.4 Coordinate development strategies with the City of Riverside.

This policy applies to the County of Riverside and is not applicable to individual development projects.

LMWAP 1.5 Encourage the use of Specific Plans to implement the land use designations identified within the Policy Area.

LMWAP 1.5 is a recommendation and not a formal requirement. The Project does not propose a Specific Plan. The Project would not prevent implementation of LMWAP 1.5.

LMWAP 1.6 Encourage clustering of dwelling units when it would avoid the development of areas constrained by physical features or sensitive resources. Encourage clustering in areas designated for Low Density Residential uses (One-half acre minimum lot size) rather than areas designated for Very Low Density Residential uses (1 acre minimum lot size) or Estate Density

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

Residential uses (2 acre minimum lot size), except where Very Low Density Residential-designated properties consisting of at least 300 acres and processed through a Specific Plan offer significant public recreational and/or areawide circulation benefits.

Where clustering is allowed, minimum pad size shall not be less than 8,000 square feet. However, for projects featuring public golf courses, a minimum pad size of 7,200 square feet will be allowed on a minimum lot size of 8,500 square feet. This pad size exception may only occur adjacent to golf courses.

The Project proposes to cluster residential development to avoid sensitive resources on-site (i.e., natural drainages). The Project is requesting a General Plan Amendment to change the subject property's land use designation to "Low Density Residential," which LMWAP 1.6 identifies as an appropriate land use designation for clustering. The minimum residential pad size proposed by the Project would be 12,101 square feet, which exceeds the minimum pad size required by LMWAP 1.6 (i.e., 8,000 square feet). Accordingly, the Project would be consistent with LMWAP 1.6.

LMWAP 1.7 *Development shall be sensitive to and retain the unique topographical features within and adjacent to the planning area.*

The Project site does not contain any unique topographic features. The majority of the site is characterized by undulating terrain, with some hillside and canyon topography that is not unique to the Project site. The Project would grade approximately 136.00 acres of the 168.33-acre Project site and retain the remaining areas and topographical features within as natural open space. Although the natural topography of the graded areas would be modified to accommodate building pads for residential development, the Project design is sensitive to the natural topography, in conformance with LMWAP 1.7.

LMWAP 1.8 *Require that development on hillsides blend with the natural surroundings through architecture, the use of appropriate construction materials and colors, and the retention of natural vegetation.*

The Project's grading concept is sensitive to the natural terrain, and manufactured slopes would be constructed and landscaped to blend with the natural surroundings to the extent feasible. Future development on the Project site would be required to comply with the *Countywide Design Guidelines* and would utilize construction materials and colors that complement the natural surroundings. Approximately 20-percent of the Project site would be retained as natural open space. The Project would be consistent with LMWAP 1.8.

LMWAP 1.9 *Restrict hillside development and grading in accordance with policies found in the Open Space, Habitat & Natural Resources section and Hillside Development and Slope section of the Land Use Element and the Scenic Resources section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element.*

The Riverside County Planning Department reviewed the Project's development plan and determined that the Project would not conflict with any policies of the Land Use and Open Space elements of the General Plan. As such, the Project would be consistent with LMWAP 1.9.

LMWAP 1.10 *Encourage open space and recreational amenities.*

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

The Project would preserve nearly 20-percent of the subject property as open space. In addition, the Project includes four (4) on-site parks for community residents. Accordingly, the Project would be consistent with LMWAP 1.10.

As demonstrated above, the Project would be consistent with the LMWAP's El Sobrante Policy Area. The proposed Project also would not conflict with any other policies of the General Plan or the LMWAP.

Based on the foregoing analysis, there are no components of the Project that would conflict with any applicable policy of the General Plan or LMWAP. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

e) With the exception of the existing residential development to the northeast of the Project site, no established communities abut the Project site. Land to the north of the Project site is planned for development as a residential community by the approved Citrus Heights Specific Plan, and the proposed Project would effectively serve as an extension of the residential uses planned for Citrus Heights. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

29. Mineral Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a, Figure OS-5; CDC, 1991; Alta 2013; Google Earth (accessed August 26, 2014)

Findings of Fact:

a & b) No mines, oil or gas wells, or other resource extraction activity occurs on the Project site or is known to have previously occurred on the property. According to mapping conducted by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, the Project site is designated within Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) Category 4. MRZ-4 encompasses areas where no known mineral resource exist, but available geologic information does not rule out either the presence or absence of mineral resource deposits. (CDC, 1991, Plate 2-A) The Project site is not identified as an important mineral resource recovery site by the County General Plan (County of Riverside, 2003a, Figure OS-5) and is not planned or zoned by the County for resource extraction. The Project's geotechnical report (Appendix E) identified that the Project site is primarily underlain by weathered (i.e., fractured, jointed,

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

porous) bedrock materials (as well as a thin surface layer of topsoil and alluvium), which are not of high value for mineral resource extraction. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not 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, nor would the Project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a land use plan. No impact would occur.

c) The area surrounding the Project site is not classified as an important mineral resource area, and there are no existing surface mines in the vicinity of the subject property (CDC, 1991, Plate 2-A; County of Riverside, 2003a, Figure OS-5). Therefore, there is no potential for the Project to be an incompatible land use adjacent to an important mineral resource recovery zone or existing, active mine. No impact would occur.

d) The proposed Project would include residential, recreational, and open space land uses and does not involve the construction or operation of a mine or quarry. As described above under Issue 29(c), the Project is not located in close proximity to any planned, existing, for former (i.e., closed, abandoned) surface mines or quarries. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or property to hazards related to mines or quarries. No impact would occur and mitigation is not required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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: RCLIS, 2014; Google Earth, 2014.

Findings of Fact:

a & b) As previously described in the response to Issue 23(c) the Project site is not subject to an airport land use plan for any airport and is not located within two (2) miles of any public use airport. Also, as previously summarized in the response to Issue 23(d), the Project site is not located within the vicinity of an active private airstrip. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not expose future residents of the Project site to excessive noise levels from airport operations. No impact would occur.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

31. Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Google Earth, 2014

Findings of Fact:

The Project site is located approximately 2.7 miles southeast of the nearest railroad corridor and no aspect of the proposed Project involves rail use or rail transport. Due to the attenuating effects of distance, intervening development and topography, railroad activity would not expose the subject property to substantial noise levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

32. Highway Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Google Earth, 2014

Findings of Fact:

No paved access roads are located on the Project site or abut the Project site under existing conditions. Access to the Project site is provided via unimproved dirt roads that connect to Vista Del Lago Drive (approximately 0.5-mile to the east of the subject property). The nearest highway to the Project site is State Route 91 (SR-91), which is located approximately 2.7 miles northwest of the subject property. Vehicular traffic along SR-91 would not expose future on-site residents to substantial noise levels due to the distance between the property and SR-91 and attenuation from intervening development and topography. Traffic volumes expected on local roads that would be constructed to service the Project site would be low, and not produce substantive noise levels. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

33. Other Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

There are no components of the Project that could expose nearby sensitive receptors to substantial noise levels, and there are no known sources of noise in the Project vicinity that could expose future Project residents to substantial noise levels. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a; Ordinance No. 847, 2006; Urban Crossroads, 2014c; Alta, 2013; Caltrans; FHA, 2012; Google Earth, 2014; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project proposes residential, recreational, and open space land uses and these uses are not typically associated with substantial sources of stationary noise. There are no components of the Project that would generate or amplify noise on the Project site. The Project would generate traffic that would emit noise; however, as discussed in detail in the response to Issue 34(c), below, Project-related traffic would not generate substantial noise during long-term operation. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b) Construction activities on the Project site, especially those involving heavy equipment, would create intermittent, short-term noise increases in the vicinity of the Project site, representing a temporary effect on ambient noise levels. Noise would be generated by construction equipment, including but not limited to trucks, graders, bulldozers, concrete mixers, and portable generators, with grading equipment generally producing the highest construction-related noise levels. Noise resulting from the Project's near-term construction activities would be consistent with the County's Noise Ordinance and, therefore, construction-level impacts would be less than significant (refer analysis under Issue 34(c), below). Regardless, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-N-1 is recommended to ensure compliance with the County's Noise Ordinance and ensure that additional noise attenuation measures are incorporated into the Project's construction plans to minimize the exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to temporary increases in ambient noise levels to such a degree that the increases would be considered less than substantial.

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

c) Development of the Project site as a residential community has the potential to expose persons to or result in elevated noise levels that exceed the County's standards during both near-term construction activities, under long-term conditions due to the potential exposure of future on-site residents to traffic-related noise from nearby streets, and under long-term conditions due to the potential for Project-related traffic to create or contribute to noise levels along off-site streets. Potential near-term (i.e., temporary) and long-term (i.e., permanent) noise level increases associated with the Project are discussed below.

Impact Analysis for Construction Noise

The County's Noise Ordinance (Ordinance No. 847) includes a provision that exempts construction activities from any maximum noise level standard, provided that construction activities occur between the hours of 6:00 AM - 6:00 PM during the months of June through September or 7:00 AM - 6:00 PM during the months of October through May. The Project is required to comply with the County's Noise Ordinance; therefore, implementation of the Project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards adopted by the County. Impacts during construction would be less than significant.

Impact Analysis for Operational Noise

Ordinance No. 847 establishes a maximum decibel level for residential land uses during the daytime hours (7:00 AM to 10:00 PM) as 55 dBA and during the nighttime hours (10:00 PM to 7:00 PM) as 45 dBA.

The Project is located in mostly undeveloped, rural area of the County with few sources of exterior noise. Residential land uses abut the Project site to the northeast and scattered rural residences are located to the east and west of the Project site. There are no industrial, commercial or other land uses in the vicinity of the Project site that could be considered substantial stationary noise sources. The Project site is not located adjacent to any collector or local streets. Accordingly, the Project site is not located in close proximity to any substantial source of noise and future residents on the Project site would not be exposed to noise levels in excess of County standards.

The proposed Project consists of a master-planned residential community with residential, recreational, and open space land uses. The land uses proposed by the Project are not typically associated with substantial sources of stationary noise. There are no components of the Project that would generate or amplify noise on the Project site. The Project would generate traffic that would travel along off-site public streets and has the potential to contribute to elevated traffic-related noise levels at off-site locations. However, as described in detail under the response to Issue 43(a), below, the Project would contribute minimal traffic to the local roadway system. Traffic-related noise levels are highest during the AM peak hour (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM) and PM peak hour (4:00 PM to 6:00 PM), when the highest concentration of vehicles are on the road. At most of the Project's study area intersections, Project-related traffic would comprise less than three (3) percent of the total traffic during the AM and/or PM peak hours, and the intersection that would receive the most Project-related traffic – the planned future intersection of McAllister Street and Street "A" – would only receive one vehicle trip per minute during the peak hour and is not located adjacent to noise-sensitive land uses. (Urban Crossroads, 2014c, pp. 32, 34, 50, 54, and 61) Based on the amount of traffic on the surrounding public roadway system and the relatively small amount of Project-related traffic, the Project has no potential to contribute a perceptible increase of 3.0 decibels (dBA) community noise equivalent level (CNEL) at off-site locations. (A change of 3.0 dBA is considered "barely" perceptible by the human ear and changes of less than 3.0

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

dBA generally cannot be perceived except in carefully controlled laboratory environments.) (FHA, 2012) Because Project-related traffic noise would not result a perceptible increase in off-site ambient noise levels, Project traffic is not expected to cause or contribute to noise levels in excess of County standards at off-site locations during long-term operation. Accordingly, the Project would not exceed County noise standards during long-term operation and impacts would be less than significant.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing analysis, the Project would not exceed County noise standards during near-term construction activities or long-term operation. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

d) The Project would not generate ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise, except, potentially, during the construction phase from the use of heavy construction equipment. According to California Department of Transportation's *Transportation and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual*, ground-borne vibration from heavy construction equipment does not create vibration amplitudes that could cause structural damage, when measured at a distance of 10 feet (California DOT, 2004, Tables 13 and 18). The nearest existing off-site structures, located to the northeast of the site are located over 100 feet from the nearest point of construction activities and would not be exposed to substantial ground-borne vibration due to the operation of heavy construction equipment on the Project site. Furthermore, the Project is not expected to employ any pile driving, rock blasting, or rock crushing equipment during construction activities, which are the primary sources of ground-borne noise and vibration during construction. As such, impacts from ground-borne vibration and noise during near-term construction would be less than significant.

There are no conditions associated with the long-term operation of the proposed Project that would result in the exposure of on- or off-site residents to excessive ground-borne vibration or noise. The proposed Project would develop the subject property as a master-planned residential community with supporting recreational and open space land uses, and would not include nor require equipment, facilities, or activities that would generate ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise. In addition, the Project site is not located within 100 feet of a railroad line or any other use associated with ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise; therefore, the Project would not expose future on-site residents to substantial ground-borne vibration or noise. Accordingly, under long-term operation the Project would not expose on- or off-site sensitive receptors to substantial ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise. Impacts are evaluated as less than significant.

Mitigation:

Although construction-related noise impacts were determined to be less than significant, the following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize the temporary or periodic noise increases that could affect nearby sensitive receptors during construction activities.

M-N-1 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning 026) Prior to grading and building permit issuance, the County shall verify that the following notes are included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by Riverside County staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.

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

- a. All construction activities shall comply with County Ordinance No. 847 (Noise Ordinance).
- b. Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards.
- c. Construction contractors shall place all stationary construction equipment in such a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors located nearest the Project site (i.e., existing residential uses to the northeast and east; and future residential uses to the north, if constructed and occupied prior to commencement of on-site construction activities).
- d. Construction contractors shall locate construction equipment staging areas in locations in the southeastern portion of the Project site, or along the site's southern or western boundaries, in order to provide the maximum distance from nearby sensitive receptors (i.e., existing residential uses to the northeast and east; and future residential uses to the north, if constructed and occupied prior to commencement of on-site construction activities).

Monitoring:

M-N-1

Prior to grading and building permit issuance, the County Department of Building and Safety shall review grading and building plans for the required notes. The Project Applicant shall ensure that the required notes are included in all construction bid documents. Construction contractors shall be required to abide by the notes listed on the grading and/or building plans, and shall permit periodic inspection by Riverside County or its designee.

POPULATION AND HOUSING	Would the project			
35. Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a; RCLIS, 2014; County Ordinance No. 460; Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a & c) Under existing conditions, there are no homes on the subject property. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not displace housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

b) The Project would construct 171 new homes on the subject property, providing housing for between 443 and 515 residents, based on the population generation standards specified in County Ordinance No. 460 and the Riverside County General Plan. The Project would provide for new housing opportunities on the site, which would help meet the current population growth trends in western Riverside County. The residential dwelling units proposed as part of the Project would not result in an increased demand for affordable housing. Therefore, the proposed Project would not create a demand for additional housing, including housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income, and no impact would occur.

d) According to RCLS, the proposed Project is not located within or adjacent to any County Redevelopment Project Areas (RCLIS, 2014). Accordingly the Project has no potential to affect a County Redevelopment Project Area, and no impact would occur.

e & f) The proposed Project would develop the subject property with 171 single-family homes. At full build-out, the Project is estimated to provide housing for between 443 and 515 residents, based on population generation standards in Ordinance No. 460 and the Riverside County General Plan. This would represent a population increase in the Project area of up to 515 new residents as compared to existing conditions. If the Project site were developed in accordance with its existing, underlying General Plan land use designations, between 407 and 473 residents reasonably could be expected on-site, or 36 to 42 fewer residents than anticipated by the Project.

The Project has little to no potential of inducing substantial off-site population growth because the subject property is located within the El Sobrante Policy Area of the LMWAP. The LMWAP applies development controls to the El Sobrante Policy Area to place a cap on future development and maintain this area's rural character and lifestyle.

Under CEQA, direct population growth by a project is not considered necessarily detrimental, beneficial, or of little significance to the environment. Typically, population growth would be considered a significant impact pursuant to CEQA if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services and requires the expansion or new construction of public facilities and utilities, or if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth results in a physical adverse environmental effect. As documented in this Initial Study, activities of the proposed Project's population would result in impacts associated with increased traffic. However, mitigation measures are provided in this Initial Study to reduce all impacts associated with the Project's population to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Project's direct impacts associated with population inducement would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

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: County of Riverside, 2003a, Safety Element; County of Riverside, 1986; Ordinance No. 659; Firesafe, 2014; Google Earth, 2014

Findings of Fact:

The Riverside County Fire Department provides fire protection services to the Project area. Pursuant to the Riverside County Fire Department *Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Master Plan*, the Project would be classified as "Category III – Rural," which requires a fire station to be within five (5) roadway miles of the Project and a full first alarm assignment team operating on the scene within 20 minutes of dispatch. The proposed Project would be primarily served by the Lake Hills Fire Station (Station No. 82), located at 17452 Lakepointe Drive, Riverside, CA 92503, or approximately four (4) roadway miles from the site, which would meet the Category III – Rural level of service criteria established by the Riverside County Fire Department (Google Maps, 2014).

Development of the proposed Project would impact fire protection services by placing an additional demand on existing Riverside County Fire Department resources should its resources not be augmented. To offset the increased demand for fire protection services, the proposed Project would be conditioned by the County to provide a minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities, including compliance with State and local fire codes, fire sprinklers, a fire hydrant system, paved access, and secondary access routes. The Project also shall be conditioned to implement a Fuel Management Plan to minimize the risk of wildland fire hazards. Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County's Development Impact Fee (DIF) Ordinance (Ordinance No. 659), which requires a fee payment to assist the County in providing for public services, including fire protection services. Payment of the DIF fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional public services, including fire protection services, which may be applied to fire facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand for fire protection services that would be created by the Project.

Based on the foregoing analysis, implementation of the Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, and would not exceed applicable service ratios or response times for fire protections services. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

37. Sheriff Services

Source: General Plan; Ordinance No. 659; Google Earth.

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

Findings of Fact:

The Riverside County Sheriff's Department provides community policing to the Project area via the Perris Sheriff's Station located at 137 N. Perris Boulevard in the City of Perris, or approximately 16.2 roadway miles from the Project site. The Riverside County Sheriff's Department has set a minimum level of service standard of 1.0 deputy per 1,000 people.

At full buildout, the Project would introduce up to 515 new residents on the Project site. There is not a direct correlation between population growth, the number of crimes committed, and the number of Sheriff's Department personnel needed to respond to these increases. As the population and use of an area increases, however, additional financing of equipment and manpower needs are required to meet the increased demand. The proposed Project would result in an increase in the cumulative demand for services from the Riverside Sheriff's Department. To maintain the desirable level of service, buildout of the proposed Project would generate a demand for approximately one-half (0.5) deputy. The proposed Project would not, however, result in the need for new or expanded physical sheriff facilities because the addition of one-half new deputy would not necessitate the construction of new or modified sheriff facilities. The proposed Project's demand on sheriff protection services would not be significant on a direct basis because the Project would not create the need to construct a new Sheriff station or physically alter an existing station.

The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County's DIF Ordinance, which requires a fee payment to assist the County in providing for public services, including police protection services. Payment of the DIF fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional police protection services, which may be applied to sheriff facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand that would be created by the Project. The Project's incremental demand for sheriff protection services would be less than significant with required payment of DIF fees.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

38. Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: County of Riverside, 2003b; State of California, 1998, California Senate Bill 50 (Greene); RUSD, 2014.

Findings of Fact:

The construction of 171 new homes as proposed by the Project would increase the population in the local area and would, consequently, place greater demand on the existing public school system by generating additional students to be served by the Riverside Unified School District (RUSD). Elementary students generated by the Project would attend Lake Mathews Elementary School, located at 12252 Blackburn Road, in the City of Riverside (approximately 4.7 roadway miles west of the Project site). The Project's middle school students would attend Miller Middle School, located at 17925 Krameria Avenue in Riverside (approximately 5.5 roadway miles east of the Project site). The Project's high school students would attend the Arlington High School, located at 2951 Jackson Street in Riverside (approximately 4.2 roadway miles North of the Project site) (RUSD, 2014). Table 7, *Project-Related School Services Demand*, provides an estimate of future students that would be generated by

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

the Project, based on the student generation factors provided in the Riverside County General Plan EIR (County of Riverside, 2003b, Table 4.15.E).

Table 7 Project-Related School Services Demand

School Type	Project Units	Student Generation Factor	Total Number of Students
Elementary	171	0.369	64
Middle School	171	0.201	35
High School	171	0.246	43
Total Project-Related Students:			142

Source: (County of Riverside, 2003b, Table 4.15.E)

Although it is possible that the RUSD may ultimately need to construct new school facilities in the region to serve the growing population within their service boundaries, such facility planning is conducted by RUSD and is not the responsibility of the Project. Furthermore, the proposed Project would be required to contribute fees to the RUSD in accordance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Senate Bill 50). Pursuant to Senate Bill 50, payment of school impact fees constitutes complete mitigation for project-related impacts to school services. Therefore, mandatory payment of school impact fees would reduce the Project's impacts to school facilities to a level below significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

39. Libraries

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

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a; Ordinance No. 659.

Findings of Fact:

Implementation of the Project would result in an increase in the population in the Project area and would increase the demand for library services. The Project would not generate the need for the physical construction of new or expanded public facilities. There are no library facilities or expansion of library facilities proposed as part of the Project.

The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County's DIF Ordinance, which requires a fee payment to assist the County in providing public services, including library services. Payment of the DIF fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of library services, and these funds may be applied to the acquisition and/or construction of public services and/or equipment (including library books). Mandatory payment of DIF fees would ensure that Project-related impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a; County of Riverside, 2003b; Ordinance No. 659.

Findings of Fact:

The proposed Project would increase the regional population and would thereby result in an increased demand for public health services. Development, like the Project, would not have a significant direct effect on public health services because the increase in the County's tax base will provide additional funding for public health services and facilities. Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County's DIF Ordinance, which requires a fee payment to assist the County in providing public services. Payment of the DIF fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional public services, and these funds may be applied to the acquisition and/or construction of public services and/or equipment. Mandatory payment of DIF fees would ensure that Project-related impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

RECREATION				
41. Parks and Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Is the project located within a C.S.A. or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: County of Riverside, 2003a; Ordinance No. 460; RCLIS, 2014.

Findings of Fact:

a & b) The Project would develop the subject property with 171 detached, single-family homes. Pursuant to population generation estimates contain in Ordinance No. 460 and the General Plan, the Project would accommodate between 443 and 515 residents. In order to present a conservative, "worst-case" scenario, this analysis assumes the Project would introduce up to 515 residents to the Project site. Based on the requirement in Ordinance No. 460 to provide a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) acres of park land for each 1,000 residents, the Project would generate a demand for between 1.5 acres and 2.8 acres of park land. The proposed Project would construct four (4) park facilities on-site, totaling approximately 3.8 acres. The Project would also construct a trail adjacent to Street "A" that would traverse the subject property. Because the proposed Project would provide for adequate on-site parkland to meet the recreational needs of the community, the proposed Project would not result

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

in a substantial increase in the use of existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or recreational facilities such that overuse would lead to or substantially contribute to their physical deterioration.

Development of proposed recreational features within the Project site would have a physical impact on the environment. However, impacts resulting from their construction are described throughout the analysis in this Initial Study. In instances where significant impacts have been identified, mitigation measures are recommended in each applicable subsection of this Initial Study to reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the construction of recreation facilities on-site would not result in any significant physical effects on the environment that are not already identified and disclosed as part of this Initial Study. Accordingly, additional mitigation measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study would not be required.

Based on the foregoing analysis, implementation of the Project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to the construction of new/expanded park facilities or the use of existing park facilities.

c) The Project site is not located within a County Service Area (CSA) or a recreation and park district with a community parks and recreation plan (RCLIS, 2014). No impact to the environment would result.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

42. Recreational Trails

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

Source: Riverside County, 2003a, LMWAP Figure 8

Findings of Fact: According to the LMWAP, a Community Trail is planned to the north of the Project site. The Riverside County Parks and Open Space District reviewed the Project and found no conflict between the Project and the planned local trail network. Additionally, the Project is conditioned to coordinate with the Riverside County Parks and Open Space District prior to and during the Project's construction phase to ensure that Project construction and operation would not interfere with or preclude implementation of the planned local trail network. The Project would construct an on-site sidewalk and trail system that would connect to the approved Citrus Heights development (located directly north of the Project site) and the County Regional Trail that traverses the Citrus Heights property. The Project would not construct any off-site recreational trails. Impacts resulting from the construction of on-site recreational trails and sidewalks are described throughout the analysis in this Initial Study. In instances where significant impacts have been identified, mitigation measures are recommended in each applicable subsection of this Initial Study to reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the construction of trails and sidewalks on-site would not result in any significant physical effects on the environment that are not already identified and disclosed as part of this Initial Study. Accordingly, additional mitigation measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study would not be required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project				
43. Circulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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: RCIP; Ordinance No. 460; Ordinance No. 461; Urban Crossroads, 2014c; RCTC, 2011; Google Earth, 2014.

Findings of Fact:

a) For purposes of analyzing the Project's potential impacts to traffic, the County of Riverside identified the traffic impact study area in conformance with their Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) preparation guidelines. Based on these guidelines, the minimum area to be studied includes any intersection of "Collector" or higher classification street, with "Collector" or higher classification streets, at which a proposed project would add 50 or more peak hour trips. For the proposed Project, the traffic study impact area includes nine (9) existing and future intersections. Refer to Appendix K for more information about the analysis methodologies employed in the Project-specific TIA prepared by Urban Crossroads.

For purposes of determining the significance of traffic impacts in accordance with the County's TIA preparation guidelines (Urban Crossroads, 2014c, pp. 14-15):

- During the weekday AM (between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m.) and/or PM (between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.) peak hour, if an intersection is projected to operate at an acceptable level of service