

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

23 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

23 Mitigation:

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

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

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

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

27 ///

28 ///

1 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

1 A. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

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

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

26 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 Mitigation:

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

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

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

1 B. Air Quality

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

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

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

6 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

22 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

13 **SCAQMD Jurisdiction:**

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

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

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

21 **MDAQMD Jurisdiction:**

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

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

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

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

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

C. Greenhouse Gases

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

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

1 Mitigation:

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

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

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

20 D. Noise

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

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

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

23 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

11 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

16 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

18 **E. Transportation and Circulation**

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

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

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

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

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

3 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

5 F. Water Resources

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

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

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

15 Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9 A. Mineral Resources

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

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

14 Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-201

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

18 A. Land Use

- 19 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 4.2.A: Physically Divide an Established Community , Impact
20 4.2.B: Conflict With Environmental Land Use Policies Intended to Avoid or Mitigate an
21 Environmental Effect, and 4.2.C: Conflict With Any Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural
22 Community Conservation Plan)

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

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

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

B. Population and Housing

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

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

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

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

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

C. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

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

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

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

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

D. Biological Resources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

20 E. Flood and Dam Inundation Hazards

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

17 F. Geology and Soils

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

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

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

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

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

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-125

G. Hazardous Materials and Safety

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

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

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

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

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

5 H. Mineral Resources

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

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

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

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

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

10 I. Parks and Recreation

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

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

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

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

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

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

16 J. Transportation and Circulation

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

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

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

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

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-175

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

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

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

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-175

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

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

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

///

///

///

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reference: Draft EIR No. 521 page 5-176

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

A. Aesthetics and Visual Resources

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

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

Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

///

///

///

1 B. Air Quality

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

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

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

23 Implementation of key regulations, General Plan policies and mitigation measures
24 discussed previously under "Project Impacts," as well as on pages 5-81 through 5-87
25 in Section 5.5 of EIR No. 521, would be sufficient to ensure that the incremental (non-
26 substantial) cumulative impacts regarding objectionable odors would be reduced to
27 less than significant levels.
28

1 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

7 C. Biological Resources

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

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

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

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

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

16 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

Cumulative Mitigation:

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

///

///

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

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

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

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

Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

D. Energy Resources

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

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

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

Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

E. Flood and Dam Inundation Hazards

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

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

Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 ///

28 ///

1 F. Geology and Soils

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

16 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

G. Noise

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

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

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

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

7 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

1 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

9 H. Public Facilities

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

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

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

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

Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

I. Water Resources

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

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

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

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

6 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

25 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

18 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

12 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

6 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 A. Population and Housing

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

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

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

22 B. Aesthetics and Visual Resources

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

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

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

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

12 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

27 ///

28 ///

1 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

16 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

1 C. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

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

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

25 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

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

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

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

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

21 Cumulative Mitigation:

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

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

D. Air Quality

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

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

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