

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



ITEM
16.1
(ID # 2980)

MEETING DATE:

Tuesday, December 6, 2016

FROM: TLMA-PLANNING:

SUBJECT: TLMA-PLANNING: 5TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE - RESOLUTION NO. 2016-233 CERTIFYING PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 548, RESOLUTION NO. 2016-234 ADOPTING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1122, ORDINANCE NO. 348.4840, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7902 AND ASSOCIATED ORDINANCE NO. 348.4841 – REQUEST: General Plan Amendment No. 1122 proposes Entitlement/Policy, Agriculture and Technical Amendments to the General Plan to ensure that the General Plan is in compliance with the State Housing Law by providing policy direction and updated land use plan to accommodate the County's regional housing needs. Ordinance No. 348.4840 will add the Highest Density Residential Zone (R-7) Zone and the Mixed Use Zone (MU) to Ordinance No. 348 and establish the allowed uses and development standards for the zones. Change of Zone No. 7902 and associated Ordinance No. 348.4841 will change the zone classifications from various zone classifications to either the R-7 Zone or MU Zone. /DISTRICTS 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 (\$1,086,302, 100% NCC).

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2016-233 certifying the Program Environmental Impact Report No. 548, which has been completed in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the Riverside County CEQA implementation procedures; and, Meadowbrook District, Mecca District, Pass and Desert District, Perris Reservoir District, Thousand Palms District and University District, shown on Map Nos. 2.2397, 65.008, 41.092, 62.019, 48.011, 33.011, 58.096, 55.039, 40.047, 5.025 and associated with Change of Zone No. 7902; and,

ACTION: Policy

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Washington, seconded by Supervisor Ashley and duly carried, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as amended to include Adoption of Resolution No. 2016-233; Approve General Plan Amendment No. 1122, Adoption of Resolution No. 2016-234; Adoption of Ordinance No. 348.4840 ; Approve Change of Zone No. 7902; Adoption of Ordinance No. 348.4841 with the revised Exhibit A dated December 6, 2016; and direct Planning Department to incorporate changes into the General Plan as outlined in GPA 1122 and the project errata as shown in attachment B.

Ayes: Tavaglione, Washington and Ashley
Nays: Jeffries
Absent: Benoit
Date: December 6, 2016
xc: Planning, Co.Co., MC, COB

Kecia Harper-Ihem
Clerk of the Board
By: 
Deputy
16.1

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


Steven Weiss, Director

11/28/2016


Juan Carlos, Director of Transportation & Land Management

11/28/2016


Gregory S. Priapros, Director County Counsel

11/28/2016

BACKGROUND:

FINANCIAL DATA	Current Fiscal Year:	Next Fiscal Year:	Total Cost:	Ongoing Cost
COST	\$ 242,584	\$ 0	\$ 1,086,302	\$ N/A
NET COUNTY COST	\$ 242,584	\$ 0	\$ 1,086,302	\$ N/A
SOURCE OF FUNDS: General Fund			Budget Adjustment: No	
			For Fiscal Year: N/A	

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION: Approve

DIRECT the Planning Department to incorporate the changes to the General Plan outlined in GPA No. 1122 and the Project errata as shown in Attachment B.

APPROVE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1122, with the modifications recommended by the Planning Commission, which amends the Riverside County General Plan by updating the General Plan Housing Element, Land Use Element, Safety Element, Appendix A-1, Appendix P-1, Appendix E-1, Appendix K-1, and nine Area Plans in accordance with Attachment B; changing the General Plan Land Use Designation in accordance with Attachment B, Exhibit 6 and making technical corrections in accordance with Attachment B, Exhibit 6 based on the findings and conclusions in the attached staff report; and,

ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2016-234 amending the Riverside County General Plan, and approving General Plan Amendment No. 1122; and,

ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 348.4840, with the modifications recommended by the Planning Commission, amending Riverside County Ordinance No. 348 by adding the Highest Density Residential (R-7) Zone and the Mixed Use (MU) Zone to Ordinance No. 348; and,

APPROVE CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7902, amending the zoning classifications for the specified parcels to either the R-7 Zone or the MU Zone as provided in Ordinance No. 348.4841 based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 348.4841, amending the zoning in the Good Hope Area, Lakeview Area, Meadowbrook Area, North Perris Area, Nuevo Area, Temescal Area, Whitewater Area, Winchester Area, Cabazon District, Lower Coachella Valley District, Mead Valley District,

Regional Needs Allocation

State law requires every city and county to prepare a Housing Element as part of its General Plan that must be reviewed and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for compliance with State housing law. To receive certification, a Housing Element must identify adequate land to accommodate building of very low, low, moderate, and market rate income housing needs based on an established Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) as assigned by the Southern California Association of Government for Riverside County. This approach will provide for a range of housing choices and varying income needs to serve our workforce, seniors, veterans, and younger population.

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

To meet the County's diverse housing needs, the Planning Department proposes a 5th Cycle Housing Element that would create vibrant, inclusive and walkable communities by redesignating approximately 1,000 parcels to Highest Density Residential (20 – 40 dwelling units per acre, HHDR) and Mixed Use Areas (MUA). A MUA Land Use Designation incorporates varying residential densities and community serving commercial, business, public facilities, light industrial and open space land uses. These MUA designations also provide that a certain percentage (between 25% and 75%) of the overall net acreage would be dedicated to HHDR development in order to meet the County's RHNA. To provide for walkability, each community incorporates the integration of parks, paseos, public squares, bicycle trails, transit systems, and pedestrian paths that would connect new communities to existing or future development. The 5th Cycle Housing Element looks at the planning period of October 2013 through October 2021.

As part of the 5th Cycle Housing Element update, the Project (General Plan Amendment No. 1122, Ordinance No. 348.4840, Change of Zone No. 7902 and Ordinance No. 348.4841) proposes a series of updates to the County's General Plan Housing Element, Land Use Element, Safety Element and the County's Land Use Ordinance No. 348, to comply with State law and meet the County's RHNA.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment and Site Selection

Pursuant to State Housing Law, the County must accommodate 50% of its RHNA units by designating and zoning properties throughout the County with the HHDR Land Use Designation and the corresponding R-7 Zone. Based on our RHNA targets, a number of parcels that yields a minimum of approximately 12,587 units are to be designated specifically for the Highest Density Residential, while the balance of the necessary high-density units may be accommodated through the Mixed Use Area designation. Mixed Use Areas afford greater design flexibility to prospective developments that would seek to create a rich mixture of community serving amenities, commercial and other uses in conjunction with denser residential uses. The proposed Project meets the aforementioned HHDR unit requirements, while providing Mixed Use Area designations that exceed the housing targets for the remaining 50% in order to provide for greater flexibility in letting the market and community input help drive the design and location of Mixed Use Areas.

The existing General Plan framework in terms of its vision statements, policies, and land use designations for community development are planning tools that the Project relies on to accommodate the units. Specifically, the HHDR and MUA Land Use Designations are ideal designations to provide capacity within or near Community Development areas which would serve, in many of the proposed new neighborhood clusters, as a new Town Center that acts as the nucleus of a transit oriented community. GPA No. 1122 affords flexibility in land use and design and provides an incentive for landowners and developers to make efficient use of land and propose different land uses or mixes of uses unique to each community.

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

The proposed HHDR and MUA sites are located throughout the County in areas that are ideally within or near existing community cores, near existing or planned major roadway access and public transit opportunities, schools, and other major public services. Planning staff started the process of identifying suitable areas by reviewing parcels that are generally vacant, one acre or larger, located near existing or future community services, in close proximity to existing or future transit stations, and that have existing or can support future supporting infrastructure.

GPA No. 1122 and the draft EIR No. 548 were released for public review in April 2016. At that time, the project identified 72 neighborhoods throughout the County. The County subsequently revised GPA No. 1122 to reflect 67 neighborhoods. These changes are in response to extensive public comment and modifications ultimately recommended by the Planning Commission on October 5, 2016 (see below and the Errata included as Attachment C). Most notably, the changes reflect lands removed from GPA No. 1122 due to Agricultural Preserve restrictions, lands subject to acquisition for the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), requests from property owners to be removed from the GPA, and community opposition to the Lee Lake HHDR neighborhoods. The revised project continues to meet the requirements established by HCD's Conditional Certification Letter dated March 21, 2016.

Suitable locations for the HHDR and MUA sites were identified within the following area plans: Eastern Coachella Valley, Elsinore, Harvest Valley/Winchester, Highgrove, Lakeview/Nuevo, Mead Valley, Southwest, Temescal Valley, the Pass and Western Coachella Valley Area Plans. Each Area Plan includes a description of the proposed HHDR and/or MUA community, its neighborhoods and policies to support HHDR and/or MUA development.

The Town Center planning approach proposed through the 5th Cycle Housing element would also help facilitate development in some currently underserved or disadvantaged communities. Properly planned and orderly growth in these areas would enhance available public services and private investment opportunities, expanding needed services and infrastructure for current as well as future residents.

Project Components:

General Plan No. 1122

General Plan No. 1122 (GPA No. 1122) replaces the existing Housing Element and delineates the County's efforts to attract and facilitate the development of a balanced housing mix to meet the needs of existing and future residents. GPA No. 1122 proposes to amend the General Plan Land Use Designation on approximately 1,000 parcels as shown in Attachment B, Exhibit 6 to provide the sufficient capacity for the County's RHNA allocation. GPA No. 1122 also updates the Safety Element, Land Use Element, nine Area Plans, and Appendices A-1, E-1, K-1 and P-1 to further the implementation of the proposed new Housing Element. The August 3, 2016 Planning Commission staff report provides a detailed explanation of the proposed changes and

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

is included as Attachment J of this staff report. The Planning Commission changes to the staff recommendations are included in Attachment B.

Ordinance No.348.4840

In order to meet the RHNA, two new zone classifications are proposed for the County's Land Use Ordinance, Ordinance No. 348. The new zone classifications include the Highest Density Residential (R-7) Zone and the Mixed-Use (MU) Zone. These zone classifications were developed to implement the General Plan's HHDR and MUA Land Use Designations. The R-7 Zone is a specialized zone created to accommodate the County's share of regional housing needs for groups of all household income level and shall only apply to parcels identified in Change of Zone No. 7902. The MU Zone was created to also assist the County in accommodating its RHNA allocation and to encourage a mixture of residential, commercial, entertainment and recreational uses. The MU Zone applies to land with a MUA land use designation or within an approved Specific Plan.

Per State law, the proposed R-7 zone classification allows multiple family dwellings and apartment homes as a use by right, and the MU zone classification allows, among others, stand-alone multiple family dwellings as a use by right. This use by right means the property owner does not need to obtain a land use permit such as a plot plan or conditional use permit for the residential portion of the project. However, there are still regulations that apply to the project and opportunities to review the project's potential impacts to surrounding properties.

For example, in the R-7 zone, multiple family dwellings and apartments will still go through a design review process which includes, among other requirements, reviewing a traffic analysis for the use. The design review has a 30-day public review period which provides the public an opportunity to submit comments on the design plan. Additionally, if the design plan creates an adverse impact on the public's health or safety, the project must address the impact. The MU zone has these same design review procedures for stand-alone multiple family dwellings. Additionally, grading permits in the County of Riverside are considered discretionary actions. As a result, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) will need to be complied with before a grading permit is issued for the project. For all other uses including commercial, office, etc. in the R-7 and MU zone classifications, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the County's discretionary review and approval process would still apply.

Additionally, all projects must comply with various County ordinances that establish mitigation fees including but not limited to payment of the mitigation fees established for the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee, the Western Riverside County MSHCP and the Coachella Valley MSHCP, and the County's Development Impact Fee (DIF) program, respectively.

Change of Zone No. 7902 and Ordinance No. 348.4841

Change of Zone No. 7902 proposes to change the zoning classifications for parcels indicated in Attachment G, Exhibit 3 to either the R-7 Zone or the MU Zone. The R-7 Zone will apply to those parcels that receive an HHDR Land Use Designation under GPA No. 1122 while the MU

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

Zone will apply to those parcels that receive the Mixed Use Area Land Use Designation. The adoption of the associated Ordinance No. 348.4841 will formally change the zoning classification on the specified parcels and amend the County's zoning map to reflect the new zoning classifications. The zoning map attached to Ordinance No. 348.4841 uses the parcel's legal description to establish the boundary for the zoning classifications. In the event a parcel included in Ordinance No. 348.4841 is subsequently divided, the property owner will need to provide an exhibit to the County establishing the new boundary of the zoning classification based on metes and bounds.

Public Outreach Efforts:

The Project was developed with a significant amount of community outreach that helped to shape the proposal. Public outreach started in June 2015 and will continue as implementing development projects move through the planning process.

Outreach efforts for GPA No. 1122 included two Planning Commission Workshops; three Planning Commission Hearings; one Airport Land Use Commission Hearing; three Countywide Public Outreach Workshop held in Mecca, Cabazon and Mead Valley; two CEQA Scoping Meetings; two meetings with Housing Advocacy Groups; Tribal Consultations; meetings with the Highgrove, Temescal Valley, and Winchester Municipal Advisory Committees; and numerous meetings with property owners and their representatives.

Owners of parcels whose land use and zoning are proposed for change as a result of GPA No. 1122, as well as interested parties that asked to be notified, were notified of each workshop and public hearing. Maps that identified suitable sites for HHDR and MUA development pursuant to GPA No. 1122, were posted online on the Planning Department website for public review and input in June 2015. The proposed Project and Draft Environmental Impact Report No. 548 were also made available for public review on the Planning Department's website. The Draft EIR No. 548 was also available for review at Planning Department offices in Riverside and Palm Desert, as well as libraries located throughout the County of Riverside.

Public Hearing Process:

ALUC

Riverside County Land Use Commission reviewed the Project on July 14, 2016 and determined it to be consistent with the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan with the removal of the parcels that are within the March Air Reserve Base Land Use Compatibility Plan Compatibility Zone C2.

Planning Commission

The Project was presented to the Planning Commission on August 3, 2016 and October 5, 2016. The Planning Department updated GPA No. 1122 Exhibit 6 prior to August 3, 2016 public hearing removing parcels that conflicted with the March Air Reserve Base Land Use

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

Compatibility Plan as well parcels that required a Foundation Component General Plan Amendments. During the public hearings, the Planning Commission received numerous comments from the public concerning the proposed project. The comments and staff's responses are captured in Attachment C of this staff report. After careful consideration of all the comments they received, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the project on October 5, 2016 by a vote of 5-0 with the following modifications:

1. Removal of parcels (as shown in Attachment B) from the project where a) property owners had requested removal from the project, b) parcels are located within an agricultural preserve, c) parcels are being acquired for conservation purposes, or d) parcels are not compatible with an Airport Land Use Plan; and,
2. Amend the Lee Lake Community by removing Neighborhood 1 from further consideration and redesignating the remaining 33 acre-Neighborhood 2 as MUA with a minimum of 30% HHDR; and,
3. Amend the Good Hope Community by designating approximately 17 acres to HHDR within an existing MUA foot print while the remaining portion of the MUA will provide at least 30% HHDR; and,
4. Modifications to Ordinance No. 348.4840 to ensure that there are at least 100 square feet of usable open space attached to a residential dwelling and clarify the window transparency requirement for street-front retail uses.

The Planning Commission's recommended modifications to specific parcel's land use designations and zone classifications are summarized on Attachment B. Changes to the proposed text and figures to reflect these changes are also included in Attachment B. The overall Project modifications are outlined in the Errata included in Attachment C.

Additional letters received after Planning Commission Hearings for Board of Supervisors consideration:

At the time of this writing, the Planning Department received four additional letters for the Board of Supervisors' consideration. The four letters were received from Eastern Municipal Water District, Richard and Allison Dean, the Rural Association of Mead Valley and the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The letters and the corresponding County responses are included in Attachment C of this staff report.

A. IMPACT ON CITIZENS AND BUSINESSES:

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

The purpose of the Project is to update the Housing Element and associated sections of the General Plan as well as update Ordinance No. 348 to ensure that the County can adequately accommodate its RHNA allocation.

The Project's Draft Program EIR No. 548 identifies specific mitigation measures that will reduce the level of many significant impacts to a less than significant level. It also identifies areas where, after implementation of all feasible mitigation, the Project may nonetheless result in impacts which cannot be fully mitigated to less than significant. Various benefits would accrue from implementation of the Project. These benefits must be weighed against the potential adverse effects of Project implementation in deciding whether to approve the Project.

The primary benefits derived from approving GPA No. 1122 are compliance with state law, meeting the diverse housing needs of the County's existing and future residents, facilitating grant funding for workforce housing, and obtaining certification from HCD. As indicated above, the proposed 5th Cycle Housing Element received conditional certification from HCD on March 21, 2016 (included as Attachment K).

Additional Fiscal Information

The total project cost is \$1,086,302 funded using the department's general fund allocation. FY 14/15 amount is \$44,306, FY 15/16 amount \$799,412, and the remaining amount of \$242,584 occurring in FY 16/17.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment A: Planning Commission Resolution No. 2016-011 Recommending Certification of EIR No. 548 and Approval of General Plan Amendment No. 1122**
- Attachment B: Post Production Changes and Draft GPA No. 1122**
- Attachment C: Draft EIR No. 548, Final Supplemental Response to Comments and Errata**
- Attachment D: Resolution No. 2016-233 Certifying Program EIR No. 548**
- Attachment E: Resolution No. 2016-234 Amending the Riverside County General Plan (Third Cycle General Plan Amendments for 2016) and adopting GPA No. 1122**
- Attachment F: Ordinance No. 348.4840**
- Attachment G: Ordinance No. 348.4841**
- Attachment H: Notice of Determination for the Program EIR No. 548**
- Attachment I: October 5, 2016 Planning Commission Agenda Item 3.1 Minutes and Staff Report**
- Attachment J: August 3, 2016 Planning Commission Agenda Item 4.1 Minutes and Staff Report**
- Attachment K: October 4, 2016 and March 21, 2016 Correspondence from the California Department of Housing and Community Development**

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



Gregory P. Priamos, Director County Counsel 11/28/2016

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-233
CERTIFYING PROGRAM EIR NO. 548
FOR THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY
5TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65350 et. seq., public hearings were held before the Riverside County Board of Supervisors ("Board") in Riverside, California on December 6, 2016 before the Riverside County Planning Commission in Perris, California on August 3, 2016 and on October 5, 2016 to consider General Plan Amendment No. 1122 which includes the Housing Element Update; and,

WHEREAS, all the procedures of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Riverside County CEQA implementing procedures have been satisfied, and Program Environmental Impact Report No. 548 (EIR No. 548), prepared in connection with General Plan Amendment No. 1122, Change of Zone No. 7902 and Ordinance No. 348.4840 (referred to herein as the "Project"), is sufficiently detailed so that all the potentially significant effects of the Project on the environment and measures necessary to avoid or substantially lessen such effects have been evaluated in accordance with CEQA and the Riverside County CEQA implementing procedures; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15151, the evaluation of environmental effects is to be completed in light of what is reasonably feasible; and,

WHEREAS, Riverside County Planning Department circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a 30-day public review period commencing June 26, 2015 and ending on August 17, 2015, and held one public scoping meeting on August 10, 2015. Further, the Riverside County Planning Department circulated a revised NOP for a 30-day public review period commencing on October 9, 2015 and ending on November 9, 2015, and held one scoping meeting on October 19, 2015; and,

WHEREAS, the County Planning Department prepared Draft EIR No. 548 (State Clearinghouse No. 2015061083) to analyze the Project. The Draft EIR No. 548 was circulated for public review and comment as specified in the State CEQA Guidelines for a 45-day period beginning on April 14, 2016 and

BY:  AARON C. GETTIS
FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
DATE 11-17-16

ending on May 30, 2016.. Public comments were received by the County Planning Department. The Project Final Program EIR No. 548, Responses to Comments document dated July 2016 (the "Responses") also provides further discussion regarding the Draft EIR notification and the purposes of EIR No. 548; and,

WHEREAS, the matter was discussed fully with testimony and documentation presented by the public and affected government agencies; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED by the Board of Supervisors County of Riverside, in regular session assembled on December 6, 2016 2016 that:

The Project includes General Plan Amendment No. 1122, Change of Zone No. 7902 and Ordinance No. 348.4840 which were all considered concurrently at the public hearings.

The Project involves the entire County of Riverside ("County"), which encompasses 7,295 square miles that stretch across 200 miles of California - from the eastern edge of the Los Angeles metropolitan basin to the Colorado River. The County is bounded by Orange County on the west, San Bernardino County to the north, the State of Arizona to the east and San Diego and Imperial Counties to the south. Riverside County is the fourth largest county in California.

A. Of the roughly 4.6 million acres within the County, approximately 10% falls within the 26 incorporated cities of the County. The remaining portions include unincorporated County lands, as well as lands outside of the County's jurisdiction, such as military bases, National Forests, state lands and Indian Reservations. The western third of the County is the most heavily populated region and contains roughly 85% of the County's total population. The eastern two-thirds of the County contain the remaining 15%, with most of the population concentrated in the Coachella Valley region.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that the following cumulative environmental issues associated with the Project are determined to have no cumulative environmental impacts with compliance with existing regulations:

A. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.2.3) Conflict with Existing Zoning for, or Cause Rezoning of Forest Land, Timberland, or Timberland Zoned Timberland Production; Result in the Loss of Forest Land or Conversion of Forest Land to Non-

1 Forest Use.

2 Riverside County does not have any commercial timber operations or any existing
3 or proposed zoning of forestland, timberland, or timberland production zones.
4 Furthermore, the County's forestry resources are located in national forests and
5 parks. For this reason, the GPA 1122 will not result in conflicts with zoning for
6 forestland and/or loss or conversion of forestland.

7 B. Biological Resources

8 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.4.5) Conflict with any Local Policies or
9 Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources, such as a Tree Preservation Policy or
10 Ordinance

11 Any conflicts between the Project and Riverside County's Oak Tree Management
12 Guidelines would be eliminated by project conditions of approval on all future
13 residential development requiring compliance with the guidelines wherever
14 qualifying oak resources are found to occur (e.g., through a biological resource
15 assessment). Biological resource protection is also afforded by Riverside County
16 Ordinance No. 559, which regulates the removal of trees. All future development
17 allowed under the proposed Project would be required to comply with Ordinance No.
18 559. Compliance with County policies and ordinances protecting biological
19 resources is required of all development projects in Riverside County during the
20 development review process. There would be no cumulative impact.

21 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following cumulative
22 environmental impacts associated with the Project are determined to be less than cumulatively considerable
23 with compliance with existing regulations:

24 A. Aesthetics

25 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.1.4) Create a New Source of Substantial
26 Light or Glare which would Adversely Affect Day or Nighttime Views in the Area

27 The increase in density/intensity potential proposed by the Project would result in
28 future high density and mixed use development that would increase urbanization

1 throughout the unincorporated County. This development would introduce new
2 sources of light and glare that would adversely affect day and/or nighttime views in
3 some areas and contribute incrementally to the cumulative light pollution levels and
4 skyglow experienced in Riverside County and Southern California.

5 Regulations: Compliance with Riverside County ordinances and General Plan policies
6 ordinances would prevent the adverse effects of increased light and glare. These
7 include, but are not limited to, the following: Ordinance No. 461, Road Improvement
8 Standards and Specifications, which includes standards for residential lighting as
9 well as lighting for highways, roadways, intersections, and traffic signage; Ordinance
10 No. 655, which addresses standards for acceptable nighttime lighting in Riverside
11 County and measures related to development within 15 to 45 miles of the Palomar
12 Observatory by requiring the use of low-pressure sodium lamps for outdoor lighting
13 fixtures and regulating the hours of operation for commercial/industrial uses in order
14 to reduce lighting impacts on the observatory; Ordinance No. 915, Regulating
15 Outdoor Lighting, which regulates light trespass in areas that fall outside of the 45-
16 mile radius of Ordinance No. 655 and requires all outdoor luminaries to be located,
17 adequately shielded, and directed such that no direct light falls outside the parcel of
18 origin or onto the public right-of-way; and GPA 960 Policy LU 4.1 (RCIP GP Policy
19 LU 4.1), which requires that new developments be located and designed to visually
20 enhance and not degrade the character of the surrounding area through consideration
21 of a number of concepts, including mitigating lighting and other impacts on
22 surrounding properties.

23 Determination: Compliance with these ordinances and policies would ensure that potential
24 adverse impacts with regard to light and glare would be avoided, minimized, or
25 reduced. As a result, light and glare impacts associated with the proposed Project
26 would be less than cumulatively considerable.

27 ///

28 ///

1 B. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

- 2 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.2.1) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique
3 Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared
4 pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California
5 Resource Agency, to no-agricultural use; Involve other changes in the existing
6 environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of
7 Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

8 The project does not include site-specific development proposals, entitlements, or
9 other project components that would directly result in the conversion of farmland.

10 The project could indirectly affect agricultural resources as a result of proposed
11 changes to land use designations and zone classifications, as well as changes to
12 General Plan policies, resulting in increased development potential on individual
13 sites throughout the County.

14 Regulations: All future development facilitated by the Project would be required to comply
15 with Riverside County Ordinance No. 625, Right-to-Farm Ordinance, which protects
16 existing agricultural uses from nuisance complaints often generated by encroaching
17 nonagricultural uses and reduces legal nuisance liabilities by requiring new
18 properties within 300 feet of any land zoned primarily for agricultural purposes to be
19 given notice of the preexisting use and its rights to continue.

20 Determination: Compliance with Ordinance No. 625 would reduce the loss of agricultural
21 resources by limiting the circumstances under which agricultural operations may be
22 deemed to constitute a nuisance. In addition, the siting of the proposed land use
23 changes are intended to direct future development away from agricultural and other
24 sensitive resource areas and toward existing and planned development consistent
25 with the direction of both GPA 960 and the 2003 RCIP GP. As the majority of sites
26 included in the Project have been previously designated for development and are
27 infill development sites, sites located along major transportation corridors, and/or
28 sites in the vicinity of future urban development and public service/utility

1 infrastructure anticipated by the County's General Plan, the Project would not result
2 in significant adverse effects to agricultural resources on a cumulative level. For
3 these reasons, impacts associated with conversion of farmland would be less than
4 cumulatively considerable.

5 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.2.2) Conflict with Existing Zoning for
6 Agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract

7 The proposed Project includes zone classification changes to land currently zoned
8 for agricultural uses.

9 Regulations: All future development facilitated would be required to comply with Riverside
10 County Ordinance No. 625, Right-to-Farm Ordinance, the intent of which is to
11 reduce the loss of agricultural resources by limiting the circumstances under which
12 agricultural operations may be deemed to constitute a nuisance.

13 Determination: On a cumulative level, most of the sites included in the proposed Project are
14 infill development sites zoned for urban uses and the Project would not result in
15 significant conflicts with agricultural zoning, lands under a Williamson Act contract,
16 or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve. Ordinance No. 625 protects
17 existing agricultural uses from nuisance complaints often generated by encroaching
18 nonagricultural uses and reduces legal nuisance liabilities by requiring new
19 properties within 300 feet of any land zoned primarily for agricultural purposes to be
20 given notice of the preexisting use and its rights to continue. For these reasons, this
21 impact would be considered less than cumulatively considerable.

22 C. Biological Resources

23 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact 3.4.6) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted
24 Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other
25 approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan

26 The WRC-MSHCP and the CV-MSHCP (also permitted as NCCPs) apply to land
27 use activities in western Riverside County and the Coachella Valley
28

1 Regulations: The MSHCPs are the cornerstones of Riverside County's General Plan
2 Multipurpose Open Space Element. As such, policies in the County General Plan
3 specifically require compliance with existing MSHCPs to ensure there are no
4 conflicts with local biological resource protections. Riverside County Ordinances
5 No. 810 and No. 875 require land use projects within the coverage areas of those
6 plans to pay a development impact fee to establish reserves and implement the
7 respective conservation plans. Riverside County Ordinance No. 663 requires
8 development projects within the Stephens' kangaroo rat HCP area to pay a
9 development mitigation fee to establish the reserves, administer the plan, and
10 otherwise meet the requirements of this HCP.

11 Determination: The project does not make any changes to how HCPs are implemented, nor
12 does it change the steps required to comply with said HCPs. Future development
13 would be required to comply with applicable fee ordinances relevant to the
14 implementation of specific programs that protect biological resources, thereby
15 reinforcing compliance with applicable resource protection policies. For these
16 reasons, impacts would be less than significant.

17 D. Geology and Soils

- 18 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.6.5) Have Soils Incapable of Adequately
19 Supporting the use of Septic Tanks or Alternative Waste Water Disposal Systems
20 where Sewers are Not Available for the Disposal of Waste Water

21 Future development accommodated by the proposed Project in areas outside of
22 existing sewer service providers would increase the potential for placement of
23 structures and facilities in areas where soils are incapable of adequately supporting
24 septic tanks, on-site wastewater treatment systems (OWTS), or alternative systems.

25 Regulations: Riverside County Ordinance No. 650, Sewer Discharge in Unincorporated
26 Territory, establishes a variety of regulations regarding OWTS, including that the
27 type of sewage facilities installed be determined on the basis of location, soil
28 porosity, site slope, and groundwater level, and designed to receive all sanitary

1 sewage from the property based on the higher volume estimation as determined by
2 either the number of bedrooms or plumbing fixture unit counts. The minimum lot
3 size required for each permanent structure with plumbing fixtures utilizing an OWTS
4 to handle its wastewater is 0.50 acre, and construction of all new septic facilities
5 requires approval from the Riverside County Health Officer (County Code Section
6 8.124.030 and Ordinance No. 650). Approval requires detailed review and on-site
7 inspections including a scaled, contoured plot plan, a soils feasibility report that
8 adequately evaluates soil percolation, a special feasibility boring report (for
9 groundwater and/or bedrock), and an engineered topographical map. Additionally,
10 the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has standards prohibiting the
11 placement of conventional septic tanks/ subsurface disposal systems in any
12 designated Zone A of an EPA wellhead protection area.

13 Determination: Compliance with regulations and programs would ensure that any OWTS
14 would be installed consistent with all applicable County requirements on soils
15 capable of supporting the system. Therefore, this impact would be less than
16 cumulatively considerable.

17 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.6.6) Destruction of Unique Paleontological
18 or Geologic Resources and/or Sites

19 Paleontological resources, including fossilized large mammal remains, are known to
20 exist in Riverside County. Future development under the Project in areas with high
21 or undetermined potential for paleontological resources could result in the
22 cumulative destruction of unique paleontological or geologic resources or sites.

23 Regulations: When existing information indicates that a site proposed for development has
24 high paleontological sensitivity, a paleontological resource impact mitigation program
25 is required for the Project that specifies steps to be taken to mitigate impacts to
26 paleontological resources (County Standard Conditions of Approval and GPA 960 and
27 RCIP GP Policy OS 19.6). These steps may include but are not limited to professional
28 site monitoring, sampling of sediments likely to contain the remains of small fossil

1 invertebrates and vertebrates, and curation procedures to be employed.

2 When existing information indicates that a site proposed for development has low
3 paleontological sensitivity, no direct mitigation is required unless a fossil is
4 encountered during site development, at which point the Riverside County Geologist
5 must be notified and a paleontologist retained by the Project applicant. The
6 paleontologist documents the extent and potential significance of the paleontological
7 resources on the site and establishes appropriate mitigation measures for further site
8 development (County Standard Conditions of Approval and GPA 960 and RCIP GP
9 Policy OS 19.7).

10 When existing information indicates that a site proposed for development has
11 undetermined paleontological sensitivity, a report is filed with the Riverside County
12 Geologist documenting the extent and potential significance of the paleontological
13 resources on-site and identifying mitigation measures for the fossils and for impacts
14 to significant paleontological resources (County Standard Conditions of Approval
15 and GPA 960 and RCIP GP Policy OS 19.8).

16 Determination: These County standard conditions of approval and General Plan policies
17 would ensure that the County's paleontological resources are protected on a
18 comprehensive, or cumulative, level and would reduce impacts to a less than
19 cumulatively considerable level.

20 E. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- 21 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.8.1) Create a Significant Hazard to the
22 Public or the Environment through the Routine Transport, use, or Disposal of
23 Hazardous Materials; Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment
24 through Reasonably Foreseeable Upset and Accident Conditions Involving the
25 Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment

26 Future development facilitated by the Project would be on or near contaminated sites
27 or facilities where hazardous materials are present, or on or near heavily traveled
28 freeways where hazardous materials are transported, thus increasing the number of

1 people and properties potentially at risk for accidental hazardous materials releases.
2 The highest probability for an inadvertent hazardous substance release in Riverside
3 County is through a vehicular accident on heavily traveled freeways and highways,
4 during remediation or grading of a contaminated site, or from an industrial accident
5 at a facility that handles large amounts of hazardous materials.

6 Regulations: The use, storage, manufacture, and transport of hazardous materials are highly
7 regulated by the state and federal governments, as well as by the Riverside County
8 Department of Environmental Health (RCDEH) and the California Highway Patrol.
9 The RCDEH Hazardous Materials Branch monitors and regularly inspects County
10 facilities that handle hazardous materials, generate hazardous waste, treat hazardous
11 waste, own/operate underground storage tanks, own/operate aboveground petroleum
12 storage tanks, or handle other materials subject to the California Accidental Release
13 Program. During inspections, facilities are evaluated against requirements found in
14 the California Code of Regulations and the California Health and Safety Code
15 pertaining to the treatment of hazardous wastes, as well as federal and state
16 requirements for the generation, treatment, and handling of hazardous materials.
17 Businesses and industries that generate, treat, and/or handle hazardous materials are
18 required to submit plans to the RCDEH to ensure these materials are being dealt with
19 appropriately. The California Accidental Release Program requires facilities that
20 handle acutely hazardous materials to submit Risk Management Prevention Plans
21 (RMPs), which are required to list the equipment and procedures that will be used to
22 prevent, mitigate, and abate releases of hazardous materials. The RCDEH Business
23 Plan/Handler Program regulates the storage and handling of hazardous materials
24 through education, facility inspections, and enforcement of state law. A major
25 requirement of the Hazardous Materials Disclosure program is the creation and
26 maintenance of a business plan, which includes an inventory of hazardous materials
27 and is made available to first responders in the County for emergency response
28 activities. In addition, Riverside County contains existing facilities that are being

remediated under federal programs including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act program and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. The US Department of Transportation Office of Hazardous Materials Safety prescribes strict regulations for the safe transportation of hazardous materials, as described in Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations and implemented by Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations. These regulations include containment rules that tell shippers how to package hazardous materials safely and drivers how to load, transport, and unload the material (Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 107.601). Finally, pursuant to Riverside County Ordinance 457, Riverside County prohibits grading without permits. In most cases, a grading permit application requires a site-specific soils report for habitable structures. Per the County's (2000) Technical Guidelines for Review of Geotechnical and Geologic Reports, the report would include a site history describing previous, existing, and proposed land uses, as well as all known past or present hazardous materials on the site (e.g., trash and debris, pits, septic tanks, underground storage tanks, farming, chemicals, fertilizers, pesticides, toxic, hazardous substance disposal/manufacturing/industrial production, and/or waste disposal/injection).

Determination: Compliance with these local, state, and federal requirements would ensure that potential risks to public health and safety resulting from hazardous materials use and transport and inadvertent hazardous substance releases would be effectively monitored and managed to minimize impacts associated with future development under the Project. For these reasons, impacts would be reduced to less than cumulatively considerable.

2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.8.2) Emit Hazardous Emissions or Handle Hazardous or Acutely Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste within One-Quarter Mile of an Existing or Proposed School.

While no schools would be planned or built as part of the proposed Project, the increase in density/intensity potential resulting from the Project could require

1 additional schools, one or more of which may be located in the vicinity of an existing
2 hazardous materials site. The siting of school facilities is determined by individual
3 school districts, based on criteria established by the California Department of
4 Education. While Riverside County can regulate the location of industrial uses in
5 unincorporated areas, it cannot control the actions of individual school districts in
6 the County, or the California Department of Education, in siting new schools. As a
7 result, the potential exists for significant impacts on school facilities resulting from
8 hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials,
9 substances, or wastes within a quarter-mile, but not as a result of the proposed
10 Project. School siting is also subject to review and approval by the California
11 Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to help ensure school sites are not
12 located on or near identified hazardous materials sites. Under a Memorandum of
13 Understanding with the California DTSC, the DTSC regulates and inspects facilities
14 both DTSC-permitted and nonpermitted hazardous waste generators in Riverside
15 County.

16 Regulations: The local, state, and federal requirements discussed for Impact 4.8.1 above
17 would ensure that potential risks to public health and safety resulting from existing
18 hazardous materials facilities/sites, hazardous materials use and transport, and
19 inadvertent hazardous substance releases would be effectively monitored and
20 managed to minimize impacts.

21 Determination: For the reasons discussed above, this impact would be considered less than
22 cumulatively considerable.

23 3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.8.3) *Be Located on a Site which is Included*
24 *on a List of Hazardous Material Sites Compiled Pursuant to Government Code*
25 *Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it Create a Significant Hazard to the Public*
26 *or the Environment*

27 Only one open/active hazardous materials site is located on the lands currently
28 proposed for changes in land use designation and zone classification as part of the

1 Project. According to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the
2 ongoing remediation of that site is in compliance with RWQCB directives and there
3 are no restrictions imposed on the case that would impede development at the site.
4 However, given the extensive distribution of hazardous material sites throughout
5 Riverside County, it is reasonable to assume that some future development facilitated
6 by the Project would be on or near contaminated sites or facilities where hazardous
7 materials are present.

8 Regulations: Existing facilities/sites are remediated under federal programs including the
9 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act program
10 and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and monitored/regulated by the
11 RCDEH. Additionally, all future development would be subject to the County's
12 development review process, which would review projects for proximity to, and
13 hazards associated with, existing hazardous materials facilities/sites.

14 Determination: For the reasons discussed above, this impact would be considered less than
15 cumulatively considerable.

- 16 4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.8.4) For a Project Located within an
17 Airport Land Use Plan or, where such a Plan has not been adopted, within two miles
18 of a Public Airport or Public Use Airport, would the Project Result in a Safety
19 Hazard for People Residing or Working in the Project Area; For a Project within
20 the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip, would the Project Result in a Safety Hazard for
21 People Residing or Working in the Project Area

22 The increase in density/intensity potential throughout the unincorporated County
23 resulting from the proposed Project could increase the number of people and
24 properties in the vicinity of public and private airports in comparison to those
25 conditions anticipated under the approved General Plan.

26 Regulations: Riverside County Ordinance No. 448, Airport Approaches Zoning Ordinance,
27 establishes airport operating areas and regulates height standards and limits therein.
28 GPA 960 Policies LU 15.1, 15.2, 15.7, 15.8, 15.9, and 31.2 (RCIP GP Policies 14.1,

1 14.2, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, and 25.2) mitigate airport-related safety hazards by requiring
2 that development proposals located within the boundaries of an airport land use plan
3 be consistent with said plan prior to approval in an effort to prevent land use conflicts
4 and reduce potential impacts. In addition, development proposals in the vicinity of
5 airports are reviewed by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, which
6 seeks to ensure safety and minimize risks to both people and property in the vicinity
7 of airports. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) policies include
8 compatibility criteria and conditions of approval for development with regulations
9 governing such issues as development intensity, density, and height of structures.

10 Determination: Compliance with the ALUCP, along with the existing County General Plan
11 policies and Ordinance No. 448, would ensure that future development
12 accommodated by the proposed Project would not result in an airport-related safety
13 hazard and impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable.

14 5. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.8.5) Interfere with Emergency Response
15 Plan

16 The project does not directly propose any changes or updates to the County's existing
17 emergency response or evacuation plans, nor does it include any components that
18 would conflict with such plans.

19 Regulations: Future development projects accommodated by the proposed Project would be
20 subject to the County's development review process, which would include a review
21 by the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) Office of Emergency Services, as
22 well as by the County's Transportation Department. The Office of Emergency
23 Services is responsible for developing emergency plans and actions in response to
24 actual or potential disasters which may impact all or part of Riverside County. It
25 would determine any project-specific impacts and necessary conditions of approval
26 associated with emergency response at the time of development review. General Plan
27 policies regarding circulation, which would further reduce potential conflicts
28 between new development and emergency plans, include GPA 960 Policy C 3.6

(RCIP GP Policy C 3.6) which requires private developers to be primarily responsible for the improvement of streets and highways that serve as access to development, including road construction or widening, installation of turn lanes and traffic signals, and the improvement of any drainage facility or other auxiliary facility necessary for the safe and efficient movement of traffic or the protection of road facilities and GPA 960 Policy C 3.24 (RCIP GP Policy C 3.24), which requires the provision of a street network with quick and efficient routes for emergency vehicles, meeting necessary street widths, turnaround radius, and other factors as determined by the Transportation Department in consultation with the RCFD and other emergency service providers.

Determination: These regulations would reduce potential emergency response and evacuation plan impacts as a result of future development accommodated by the proposed Project to less than cumulatively considerable levels.

6. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.8.6) Expose People or Structures to a Significant Risk of Loss, Injury or Death Involving Wildland Fires, including where Wildlands are Adjacent to Urbanized areas or where Residences are Intermixed with Wildlands

The project would accommodate both high-density residential and mixed-use development throughout the unincorporated County, including in previously undeveloped areas with high or very high fire hazards. The increase in density/intensity potential throughout the unincorporated County resulting from the proposed Project could increase the number of people and properties potentially exposed to fire hazards in comparison to those conditions anticipated under the approved General Plan. Additionally, there is the potential for an increase in the occurrence of fires, particularly in urban-wildland interface areas, due to increasing human encroachment. The risk of death, injury, or property damage from fire may rise to unacceptable fire risks if land uses are allowed in areas of high or unacceptable

///

1 risk without proper planning or protection, or if roads are inadequate for fire access
2 and evacuation.

3 Regulations: Ordinances pertaining to building homes in the wildland include PRC 4290,
4 PRC 4291, Riverside County Ordinance No. 787, and the 2010 California Building
5 Standards Code, Chapter 7A, Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior
6 Wildfire Exposure. Ordinance No. 787 adopts the Uniform Fire Code and adds
7 requirements to further protect people and structures from fire risks, including
8 standards for various land uses that ensure appropriate fire protection measures are
9 incorporated into the design, construction, and operation of these land uses.
10 Ordinance No. 787 includes requirements for fire-retardant building materials as well
11 as requirements to ensure that buildings would not impede emergency egress for fire
12 safety personnel, and equipment and apparatus would not hinder evacuation from
13 fire, including potential blockage of stairways or fire doors. In addition, Ordinance
14 No. 695, requires the abatement of hazardous vegetation that is flammable and
15 endangers public safety by creating a fire hazard.

16 Determination: All future development under the proposed Project would be reviewed by
17 the Riverside County Department of Building and Safety and the Riverside County
18 Fire Department (RCFD), both of which enforce fire standards (such as those in
19 Riverside County Ordinance No. 787) as they review building plans and conduct
20 building inspections. Review would ensure that future development would not
21 expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving
22 wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where
23 residences are intermixed with wildlands. RCFD review and fire standards and
24 regulations would reduce impacts to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

F. Hydrology and Water Quality

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.9.8) *Expose People or Structures to a Significant risk of Loss, Injury, or Death Involving Flooding, Including Flooding as a result of the Failure of a Levee or Dam*

The proposed project would increase the density/intensity potential of housing and structures already planned to be located in known (mapped) dam inundation hazards.

Regulations: Riverside County Ordinance No. 458 and GPA 960 Policies S 4.1 through S 4.4 (RCIP GP Policies S 4.1 through S 4.4), as described under the finding for Impact Analysis 3.9.7, would be required during the development review process for any future projects.

Determination: These regulations would ensure that risks associated with development in dam inundation zones and other areas potentially prone to flooding or inundation hazards due to failure of a flood control facility would be less than cumulatively considerable.

2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.9.9) *Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow*

In terms of seiche hazards, there is no documented significant potential for any of the water bodies in Riverside County. Based on morphology and hydrology, two water bodies in the County (Lake Perris and Lake Elsinore) may have the potential for seismically induced seiche. However, setbacks and flood hazard area regulations would be sufficient to protect against significant risks. Thus, for the proposed Project, future development along or near lakes and reservoirs is considered to be at minimal risk. Overall, seiche impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable. Due to its inland location, by definition there are no tsunami risks in Riverside County. In terms of mudflow hazards, areas of proposed land use-related changes with the potential for intensifying future development are generally at risk for mudflow hazards if they are on or below a steep or unstable slope; in a steep-sided canyon; in an area with flash flood potential, on loose, unconsolidated soils; or in an

1 area denuded of vegetation by recent wildfire, particularly if any of the other factors
2 also occur.

3 Regulations: The site design and engineering requirements established for 100-year flood
4 hazard area management (refer to finding for Impact Analysis 3.9.7) and for erosion
5 and unstable soils (refer to finding for Impact Analysis 3.6.4) generally provide
6 sufficient measures to ensure the protection of development from mudflow.

7 Determination: Compliance with the County's regulations and policies would ensure that
8 people and property are not exposed to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow
9 and would ensure impacts remain at a less than cumulatively considerable level.

10 G. Land Use and Planning

11 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.10.1) *Physically Divide an Established*
12 *Community*

13 The physical division of an established community could generally occur via
14 placement of a freeway, railroad, airport, dam or large area of open space in an
15 established community. The proposed Project would not result in the placement of a
16 freeway, railroad, airport, dam or large area of open space in an established
17 community, or any other land use activity that would otherwise divide an established
18 community. Future development would be integrated with the existing community
19 and would not divide it. Therefore, this would be a less than cumulatively
20 considerable impact.

21 Regulations: None applicable

22 Determination: Less than cumulatively considerable

23 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.10.2) *Conflict with any Applicable Land*
24 *Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation of an Agency with Jurisdiction over the Project*
25 *adopted for the Purpose of Avoiding or Mitigating an Environmental Effect*

26 The objective of the proposed Project is to bring the Housing Element into
27 compliance with state housing law and to meet a statutory update requirement, as
28 well as to help the County meet its state-mandated Regional Housing Needs

Allocation (RHNA) obligations. The Housing Element itself is one of the seven General Plan elements mandated by the state (Sections 65580 to 65589.8 of the Government Code). As such, the proposed update to the Housing Element would implement and enhance, rather than conflict with, the land use plans, policies, and programs of the remainder of the General Plan, as well as the County's other ordinances and regulatory programs. The proposed revisions to the text of the General Plan and Ordinance No. 348 are intended both to adopt and implement the new HHDR and MUA land use designations and zone classifications and to comply with changes in state law and implementation of the Housing Element programs, including those encouraging multifamily development. These revisions will better integrate the County's General Plan policies, Ordinance No. 348, and other regulatory programs with opportunities to implement the County's housing goals with respect to meeting the needs of existing and future residents, including accommodating the development of a variety of housing types, styles, and densities that are accessible to and meet the needs of a range of lifestyles, physical abilities, and income levels. Furthermore, the Project seeks to accommodate the County's future housing in existing and planned urban areas where growth is best suited to occur, a land use pattern that is consistent with the Vision Statement of the County's General Plan as amended by GPA No. 960 and the 2003 RCIP General Plan. The Project would not remove or modify any General Plan or other County policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, nor would it conflict with them. For these reasons, this impact would be a less than cumulatively considerable impact

Regulations: None applicable

Determination: Less than cumulatively considerable

3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.10.3) Conflict with any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan

1 Applicable habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans are
2 discussed under the finding for Impact Analysis 3.4.6. As discussed, policies in the
3 County's General Plan specifically require compliance with existing MSHCPs to
4 ensure there are no conflicts with local biological resource protections. The proposed
5 Project does not make any changes to how the County's habitat conservation plans
6 are implemented, nor does it change the steps required to comply with these habitat
7 conservation plans. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any applicable
8 habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan and impacts would
9 be less than cumulatively considerable.

10 Regulations: None applicable

11 Determination: Less than cumulatively considerable

12 H. Mineral Resources

- 13 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.11.1) Result in the Loss of Availability of a
14 Known Mineral Resource that would be of value to the Region and the Residents of
15 the State; Result in the Loss of Availability of a Locally Important Mineral Resource
16 Recovery Site Delineated on a Local General Plan, Specific Plan or other Land Use
17 Plan

18 Implementation of the proposed Project could result in potential direct future loss of
19 land designated as containing a known mineral resource, as well as residential
20 development adjacent to areas of known or inferred to possess mineral resources
21 (MRZ-2 areas), which is generally incompatible with mineral extraction activities
22 and therefore could also result in encroachment or preclusion of potentially important
23 mineral resources.

24 Regulations: Implementation of and compliance with current regulations and Riverside
25 County General Plan policies would ensure that significant impacts to known mineral
26 resources of regional or statewide significance are either avoided or minimized to
27 less than significant, including but not limited to the following: GPA 960 Policy LU
28 9.7, which seeks to protect lands designated by the SMGB as being of regional or

1 statewide significance from encroachment of incompatible land uses by requiring
2 incorporation of buffer zones or visual screening into the incompatible land use (no
3 similar RCIP GP policy); GPA 960 Policy OS 14.3 (RCIP GP Policy 14.3), which
4 prohibits land uses incompatible with mineral resource recovery in areas designated
5 Open Space-Mineral Resources and in areas designated by the SMGB as being of
6 regional or statewide significance; GPA 960 Policy OS 14.4 (RCIP GP Policy 14.4)
7 which requires the County Geologist to impose conditions as necessary on proposed
8 mining operation projects to minimize or eliminate the potential adverse impact of
9 mining operations on surrounding properties and environmental resources; GPA 960
10 Policy OS 14.5 (RCIP GP Policy 14.5), which requires that new non-mining land
11 uses adjacent to existing mining operations be designed to provide a buffer between
12 the new development and the mining operations; GPA 960 Policy LU 27.2 (RCIP
13 GP Policy 21.2); which seeks to protect lands designated as Open Space-Mineral
14 Resource from encroachment of incompatible land uses through buffer zones or
15 visual screening; and GPA 960 Policy LU 27.3 (RCIP GP Policy 21.3), which
16 protects road access to mining activities and seeks to prevent traffic conflicts with
17 surrounding properties.

18 Determination: These regulations would ensure that the environmental impacts of existing
19 and future mining activities are minimized and that conflicts between mining and
20 non-mining land uses are also minimized or avoided. For these reasons, adverse
21 impacts to mineral resources resulting from future implementation of the proposed
22 Project would be less than cumulatively considerable.

23 I. Noise

- 24 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.12.4) For a project located within an
25 airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles
26 of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or
27 working in the project area to excessive noise levels; For a project within the vicinity
28

1 of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working the project
2 area to excessive noise levels.

3 Future development accommodated by the Project may result in the exposure of new
4 noise-sensitive land uses to noise from operations at public and private airports,
5 airstrips, and helipads. Around larger public airports, noise levels can exceed
6 acceptable standards in certain areas, as shown by noise-contour maps of existing,
7 future, and ultimate buildout operational conditions for public airports.

8 Regulations: The ALUCP adopted by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
9 addresses noise-related land use constraints for the various zones surrounding
10 airports in the County. All future development proposed would be required to comply
11 with applicable Airport Land Use Commission policies, as well as with state and
12 county regulations and policies, regarding site design and building construction to
13 achieve acceptable interior and exterior noise exposure levels for habitable
14 structures.

15 Determination: Compliance with ALUCP and other applicable standards would ensure that
16 airport-related noise impacts on future development pursuant to the Project would be
17 less than cumulatively considerable.

18 J. Population and Housing

- 19 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.13.2) Displace substantial numbers of
20 existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere;
21 Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of
22 replacement housing elsewhere

23 Most of the sites identified for changes in land use designation as a result of the
24 Project are currently vacant; none contain substantial numbers of existing homes
25 whose loss would necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere. This
26 is particularly true given that the proposed Project would cumulatively result in the
27 capacity for up to 73,255 more dwelling units and 240,805 more people in the County
28 in comparison to buildout of the adopted General Plan (refer to finding for Impact

1 Analysis 3.13.1). Additionally, the Project would include text revisions to the
2 General Plan and Ordinance No. 348 that encourage multifamily development in the
3 County. Therefore, the Project would accommodate an increase in housing
4 opportunities in the County and would not displace substantial numbers of existing
5 housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
6 and the Project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact.

7 Regulations: None applicable

8 Determination: Less than cumulatively considerable

9 K. Public Services

10 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.14.1) *Increased Demand for Fire Protection*
11 *and Emergency Services*

12 The proposed project would accommodate future development of both high-density
13 residential and mixed-use development that would incrementally increase the demand
14 for fire protection and emergency services in localized areas throughout
15 unincorporated Riverside County. If these areas are built out to capacity, the
16 cumulative effect of increased fire service demand resulting from future development
17 facilitated by the Project could trigger the need for new or physically altered Riverside
18 County Fire Department (RCFD) facilities, staff, and/or equipment, including the
19 need for up to 37 new RCFD fire stations ($73,255 \text{ du} / 2,000 \text{ du} = 37 \text{ stations}$) beyond
20 those already anticipated for buildout of current land use designations.

21 Regulations: During the development review process, all future development would be
22 subject to review by both the RCFD and the Riverside County Department of Building
23 and Safety, both of which enforce fire standards including the Uniform Fire Code,
24 PRC Sections 4290–4299, and California Government Code section 51178. In
25 addition, the County requires all new structures in unincorporated areas to comply
26 with the construction requirements of the California Building and Fire Codes, which
27 include minimum standards for access, fire flow, building ignition and fire resistance,
28 fire protection systems and equipment, defensible space, and setback requirements.

County Ordinance No. 787 includes requirements for high-occupancy structures to further protect people and structures from fire risks, including requirements that buildings not impede emergency egress for fire safety personnel and that equipment and apparatus not hinder evacuation from fire, such as potentially blocking stairways or fire doors. GPA 960 Policies LU 5.1 and 5.2 (RCIP GP Policies LU 5.1 and LU 5.2) prohibit new development from exceeding the ability to adequately provide supporting infrastructure and services, including fire protection services, and GPA 960 Policy S 5.1 (RCIP GP Policy S 5.1) requires proposed development to incorporate fire prevention features. Finally, in order to ensure adequate services, the County requires new development to pay fire protection mitigation fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 659. These fees are used by the RCFD to construct new fire protection facilities or to provide facilities in lieu of the fee as approved by the RCFD.

Determination: As future development in the County would be required to contribute its fair share to fund fire facilities via fire protection mitigation fees, construction of any RCFD facilities would be subject to CEQA review, and compliance with existing regulations would reduce the impacts of providing fire protection services concurrent with new development, the increase in density/intensity potential associated with the Project would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts associated with the provision of fire protection and emergency services.

2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.14.2) Increased Demand for Law Enforcement Services

The proposed Project would accommodate future development of both high-density residential and mixed-use development that would incrementally increase the demand for law enforcement services in localized areas throughout unincorporated Riverside County. If areas are built out to capacity, the cumulative effect of increased law enforcement service demand resulting from future development facilitated by the Project could trigger the need for new or physically altered Riverside County Sheriff's Department (RCSD) facilities, staff, and/or equipment, including the need for up to

361 sworn police officers, 52 supervisors, 52 support staff, and 120 patrol vehicles beyond what has been anticipated for buildout of the current General Plan (refer to Table 3.14-4 of the Draft EIR).

Regulations: GPA 960 Policies LU 5.1 and 5.2 (RCIP GP Policies LU 5.1 and LU 5.2) prohibit new development from exceeding the ability to adequately provide supporting infrastructure and services, including law enforcement services. Pursuant to Ordinance No. 659, the County requires the development applicant to pay the RCSD an established development mitigation fee prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy on any structure as each is developed. The fees are for the acquisition and construction of public facilities.

Determination: Future development facilitated by the Project would be reviewed by the RCSD for the provision of adequate services, and additional officers and facilities would be funded through payment of mitigation fees and taxes. Furthermore, any facilities needed would be subject to project-specific CEQA review. Therefore, impacts associated with the provision of law enforcement services would be less than cumulatively considerable.

3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.14.3) Increased Demand for Public School Facilities

Based on student generation rates used by Riverside County to represent the number of students, or the portion thereof, expected to attend district schools from each new dwelling unit, full buildout of future development accommodated by the proposed Project would be expected to result in up to 59,775 additional students in Riverside County beyond what has been anticipated (refer to Table 3.14-5 in the Draft EIR). This would result in the need for additional classroom space and teaching and support staff where increases exceed current capacity. Where increases trigger new school facilities or expansion of existing facilities, environmental impacts could potentially occur.

1 Regulations: Pursuant to the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act (SB 50), future
2 development would be required to pay residential and commercial/industrial
3 development mitigation fees to fund school construction. Under CEQA, payment of
4 development fees is considered to provide full mitigation for the impact of a proposed
5 project on public schools.

6 Determination: Expansion of an existing school or construction of a new school would have
7 environmental impacts that would need to be addressed once the school improvements
8 are proposed. It is likely that growth associated with the Project will occur over time,
9 which means that any one development is unlikely to result in the need to construct
10 school improvements. Instead, each future development project will pay its share of
11 future school improvement costs prior to occupancy of the building. As stated above,
12 payment of development fees is considered to provide full mitigation for the impact
13 of a proposed project on public schools under CEQA.

14 L. Parks and Recreation

15 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.15.1) *Increased Demand for Park and*
16 *Recreation Facilities*

17 The incremental increase of people associated with the Project would be spread over
18 the entire County in various amounts. The specific environmental impacts resulting
19 from the provision of parks and recreational facilities would be identified by project-
20 level environmental review of those future park facilities. Therefore, this impact
21 would be less than cumulatively considerable.

22 Regulations: Growth instigated by the proposed Project would generate an incremental net
23 increase in park needs, i.e., increase the number of people using existing recreational
24 resources and necessitate the provision of new facilities to maintain adequate levels
25 of service, pursuant to the County's parkland standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population
26 (GPA 960 Policy LU 25.4/RCIP GP Policy LU 19.4).

27 Determination: Less than cumulatively considerable

28 M. Transportation/Traffic

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.16.2) Result in a Change in Air Traffic Patterns, Including either an Increase in Traffic Levels or a Change in Location that Results in Substantial Safety Risks

Palm Springs International Airport is the only airport in Riverside County that has regularly scheduled commercial passenger flights and any future development facilitated by the Project would be reviewed for consistency with the ALUCP, which would ensure that airport operations, including air traffic patterns, would not be affected. Therefore, this impact is considered less than cumulatively considerable

2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.16.3) Substantially Increase Hazards Due To A Design Feature Or Incompatible Uses

The proposed project would accommodate future development of both high-density residential and mixed-use development, which could result in the need for additional transportation and circulation infrastructure throughout the County. If not constructed according to the appropriate design criteria, hazards could occur.

Regulations: Implementation of and compliance with current regulations and Riverside

County General Plan policies would ensure that traffic hazards are either avoided or minimized to less than significant. They include but are not limited to the following: Riverside County Transportation Department Improvement Standards and Specifications (County Ordinance No. 461), as well as to Caltrans Standard Plans and Specifications, which include roadway design criteria to ensure that improvements would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses; GPA 960 Policy C 3.4 (RCIP GP Policy C 3.4), which allows Riverside County to use a variety of design techniques such as continuous flow intersections, provided that a detailed study has been completed showing that these facilities could improve safety; GPA 960 Policy C 3.23 (RCIP GP Policy C 3.23), which directs Riverside County to consider the use of traffic-calming techniques to improve safety in neighborhoods; and GPA 960 Policy C 6.5 (RCIP GP Policy C

6.5), which recommends the placement of access locations for properties to maximize safety.

Determination: The proposed Project does not include components that would substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses and the above regulations would ensure future development would not substantially increase hazards. For these reasons, impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable.

3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.16.4) *Emergency Access*

The proposed project would accommodate future development of both high-density residential and mixed-use development, which would require coordinated emergency access.

Regulations: Implementation of and compliance with Riverside County General Plan policies would ensure that significant impacts associated with the provision of emergency access are either avoided or minimized to less than significant, including but not limited to the following: GPA 960 Policy C 3.24 (RCIP GP Policy C 3.24), which requires the County to consult with the Fire Department and other emergency service providers in order to provide a street network with quick and efficient routes for emergency vehicles, meeting necessary street widths, turnaround radius, secondary access, and other factors as determined by the Transportation Department.

Determination: The General Plan policy above would ensure the provision of adequate emergency access in street networks for new development. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.16.5) *Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Public Transit, Bicycle, or Pedestrian Facilities, or Otherwise Decrease the Performance or Safety of such Facilities*

Future development accommodated by the Project could result in a cumulative increase in the demand for public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

Regulations: Implementation of and compliance with Riverside County General Plan policies promote the provision of alternative transportation facilities, including but

not limited to the following policies: GPA 960/RCIP GP Policies C 4.1 through 4.4, which address the provision of safe pedestrian access in new development and roadway projects, specifically requiring that project design include pedestrian access from developments to existing and future transit routes (C 4.3); GPA 960 Policy C 4.6 (RCIP GP Policy C 4.6), which states that the County of Riverside can require that development proposals provide pedestrian facilities as a condition of approval; and GPA 960/RCIP GP Policies C 11.1 through 11.5, which address the provision of transit facilities and/or transit access, including requirements for transit right-of-way (C 11.1) and incentives for new development to encourage location in a transit-oriented area (C 11.4).

Determination: Compliance with the above listed General Plan policies would ensure that the Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Therefore, this impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.

N. Utilities and Service Systems

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.17.3) Increased Demand for Park and Recreation Facilities

The proposed project would accommodate increased density/intensity throughout the unincorporated County, which has the potential to increase the number of people and structures generating wastewater. This growth would incrementally increase the amount of wastewater generated, which could require additional wastewater treatment capacity to serve projected demand as well as additional wastewater treatment facilities. Using the average wastewater generation rate for a residential unit in Riverside County of 230 gallons per day per capita, future development from the Project could result in the cumulative generation of 55.38 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater beyond that anticipated under buildout of the General Plan. The

1 need for specific facilities/capacity is determined through subsequent development
2 review performed at the time of implementing project review.

3 Regulations: Ordinance No. 659, DIF Program, is intended to mitigate growth impacts in
4 Riverside County by ensuring fees are collected and expended to provide necessary
5 facilities commensurate with the ongoing levels of development, including any
6 potential future expansion wastewater treatment facilities. Future development
7 would also be subject to Riverside County Ordinance No. 592, Regulating Sewer
8 Use, Sewer Construction and Industrial Wastewater Discharges in County Service
9 Areas, which sets various standards for sewer use, construction, and industrial
10 wastewater discharges to protect both water quality and the infrastructure conveying
11 and treating wastewater by establishing construction requirements for sewers,
12 laterals, house connections, and other sewerage facilities, and by prohibiting the
13 discharge to any public sewer (which directly or indirectly connects to Riverside
14 County's sewage system) any wastes that may have an adverse or harmful effect on
15 sewers, maintenance personnel, wastewater treatment plant personnel or equipment,
16 treatment plant effluent quality, or public or private property or which may otherwise
17 endanger the public or the local environment or create a public nuisance. As a result,
18 this ordinance serves to protect water supplies, water and wastewater facilities, and
19 water quality for both surface water and groundwater. In addition, increased demand
20 resulting from the Project would likely occur incrementally as the result of many
21 individual implemented projects scattered across the unincorporated County over a
22 period of many years.

23 Determination: Therefore, it is feasible that wastewater service providers in Riverside
24 County would continue to expand their treatment capacities consistent with demand.
25 Conservation methods and the increased use of reclaimed water would help decrease
26 the need for treatment and storage capacity and provide for beneficial reuse of water.
27 Also, the construction of additional wastewater treatment plants, as well as water
28 reclamation and storage facilities, would be subject to additional environmental

analysis to determine on-site impacts. For these reasons, this impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.

O. Energy Consumption

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.18.1) *Use of Fuel or Energy in Wasteful Manner*

Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the proposed Project could result in the use of fuel or energy in a wasteful manner. The increase in electricity usage as a result of the Project would constitute an approximate 3.9 percent increase in the typical annual electricity consumption and an approximate 4.0 percent increase in the typical annual natural gas consumption attributable to all residential buildings in Riverside County (refer to Table 3.18-4 in the Draft EIR). The increase in automotive fuel would increase use in the County by 3.9 percent.

Regulations: The residential development allowed under the proposed Project would be required to comply with Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which provide minimum efficiency standards related to various building features, including appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment, building insulation and roofing, and lighting. Implementation of the Title 24 standards significantly reduces energy usage. Furthermore, the electricity provider, SCE, is subject to California's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS). The RPS requires investor-owned utilities, electric service providers, and community choice aggregators to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources to 33 percent of total procurement by 2020 and to 50 percent of total procurement by 2030.

Determination: For the reasons described above, the proposed Project would not place a substantial demand on regional energy supply or require significant additional capacity, or significantly increase peak and base period electricity demand, or cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during project construction, operation, and/or maintenance, or preempt future energy development

1 or future energy conservation. Therefore, this impact would be less than
2 cumulatively considerable.

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

12 A. Aesthetics

13 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.1.1) Have a Substantial Adverse Effect on
14 a Scenic Vista

15 The new R-7 and Mixed Use zone classifications resulting from the Project allow
16 buildings and structures up to 50 feet in height, which would represent an increase
17 in height beyond that previously considered for development in Riverside County,
18 and could thus create adverse effects to scenic vistas by altering panoramic views to
19 more urban, higher-density development with views partially obscured by structures.

20 Regulations: Compliance with General Plan policies governing the visual impact of new
21 development would reduce impacts related to substantial adverse effects on scenic
22 vistas. These include, but are not limited to, the following: GPA 960 Policy LU 4.1
23 (RCIP GP Policy LU 4.1), which requires new developments to be located and
24 designed to visually enhance and not degrade the character of the surrounding area;
25 and GPA 960 Policy LU 14.8 (RCIP GP Policy LU 13.8), which prohibits the
26 blocking of public views by solid walls.

27 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.1.1 states, "Development projects shall be subject to
28 the requirements of all relevant guidelines, including the community center

1 guidelines, Riverside County supervisorial district guidelines and all applicable
2 standards, policies, and/or regulations of the County of Riverside or other affected
3 entities pertaining to scenic vistas and aesthetic resources. Factors considered in
4 these guidelines include the scale, extent, height, bulk or intensity of development;
5 the location of development; the type, style and intensity of adjacent land uses; the
6 manner and method of construction, including materials, coatings, and landscaping;
7 the interim and/or final use of the development; the type, location, and manner of
8 illumination and signage; the nature and extent of terrain modification required; and
9 the potential effects to the established visual characteristic of the Project site and
10 identified scenic vista or aesthetic resource.”

11 Determination: Compliance with General Plan policies, plus mitigation measure MM 3.1.1,
12 would ensure that future development accommodated by the Project would have a
13 less than cumulatively considerable impact on scenic vistas by ensuring that issues
14 are analyzed and addressed during the development review process and that
15 buildings would be sited and set back such that identified scenic vistas would be
16 protected to the extent feasible. Therefore, impacts would be reduced to a less than
17 cumulatively considerable level.

18 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.1.2) Substantially Damage Scenic
19 Resources, Including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and Historic
20 Buildings within a State Scenic Highway

21 Future development under the Project would include apartments and condominiums,
22 multistory (3+) structures, and mixed-use development located primarily along
23 major transportation corridors; this development could cumulatively impact scenic
24 resources within a state scenic highway.

25 Regulations: Compliance with General Plan policies governing the visual impact of new
26 development would reduce impacts to scenic resources within state scenic highways.
27 These include, but are not limited to, the following: GPA 960 Policy LU 4.1 (RCIP
28 GP Policy LU 4.1), which requires new developments to be located and designed to

visually enhance and not degrade the character of the surrounding area; and GPA 960 Policies OS 22.1 and OS 22.4 (RCIP GP Policies OS 22.1 and OS 22.4), which directly regulate development within scenic highway corridors, requiring that developments within designated scenic highway corridors be designed to balance the objectives of maintaining scenic resources with accommodating compatible land uses and that conditions be placed on development within scenic highway corridors requiring dedication of scenic easements when necessary to preserve unique or special visual features.

Mitigation: Similar to Impact Analysis 3.1.1 discussed above, compliance with mitigation measure MM 3.1.1 would ensure that potential effects to identified aesthetic resources, including those within a scenic highway corridor, would be addressed during the development review process.

Determination: Compliance with these regulatory measures and mitigation measures MM 3.1.1 would ensure that scenic resources within the County's scenic highway corridors would be protected during future development activities and would reduce cumulative impacts to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.1.3) *Substantially degrade the existing Visual Character or Quality of the Site and its Surroundings*

Future development under the Project could include apartments and condominiums, multistory (3+) structures, and mixed-use development. The new R-7 and Mixed Use zone classifications allow buildings and structures up to 50 feet in height, minimum front and rear setbacks of 10 feet for buildings that do not exceed 35 feet in height, and side yard setbacks of 5 feet for buildings that do not exceed 35 feet in height. This development would represent an increase in density, massing, and height beyond that originally considered and could alter the existing visual character of Riverside County.

Regulations: Several local regulations and General Plan policies would reduce impacts related to substantial adverse effects on the visual character of the area. These

1 include, but are not limited to, the following: GPA 960 Policy LU 4.1 (RCIP GP
2 Policy LU 4.1), which requires new developments to be located and designed to
3 visually enhance and not degrade the character of the surrounding area; and the
4 Countywide Design Standards and Guidelines, which include requirements that
5 address scale, intensity, architectural design, landscaping, sidewalks, trails,
6 community logo, signage, and other visual design features, as well as standards for
7 backlighting and indirect lighting to promote “night skies.” Typical design
8 modifications would include stepped setbacks for multistory buildings, increased
9 landscaping, decorative walls and roof design, and themed signage.

10 Mitigation: For the similar reasons as for Impacts 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, mitigation measure MM
11 3.1.1 also applies here. The measure confirms that development projects are subject
12 to County requirements pertaining to aesthetic resources, including regulations on
13 the scale, extent, height, bulk, or intensity of development; the location of
14 development; the type, style, and intensity of adjacent land uses; the manner and
15 method of construction, including materials, coatings, and landscaping; the interim
16 and/or final use of the development; the type, location, and manner of illumination
17 and signage; the nature and extent of terrain modification required; and the potential
18 effects to the established visual characteristic of the Project site and identified scenic
19 vista or aesthetic resource.

20 Determination: Regardless of a development’s specific location in the County, regulatory
21 compliance measures, as well as mitigation measure MM 3.1.1 as discussed below,
22 would ensure that the potential aesthetic impacts of all new development proposals
23 would be analyzed and addressed during the development review process and would
24 therefore be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

25 B. Air Quality

26 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.3.5) Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to
27 Substantial Toxic Emissions
28

1 Future development accommodated by the Project could potentially include short-
2 term construction sources and long-term operational sources of toxic air
3 contaminants (TACs), including stationary and mobile sources. The degree of
4 impact would depend on the type of operation, distance from sensitive receptors, and
5 the level of activity at each site.

6 Regulations: Several regulations and General Plan policies would reduce impacts related to
7 substantial toxic emissions. These include, but are not limited to, the following: GPA
8 960 Policy AQ 4.7 (RCIP GP Policy AQ 4.7), which states that to the greatest extent
9 possible, every project is required to mitigate any of its anticipated emissions that
10 exceed allowable emission thresholds; GPA 960 Policy AQ 2.2 (RCIP GP Policy AQ
11 2.2), which requires site plan designs to protect people and land uses sensitive to air
12 pollution through the use of barriers and/or distance from emissions sources when
13 possible; GPA 960 Policy AQ 4.5, which requires stationary pollution sources to
14 minimize the release of toxic pollutants through design features, operating
15 procedures, preventive maintenance, operator training, and emergency response
16 planning; GPA 960 Policy AQ 4.6 (RCIP GP Policy AQ 4.6), which requires
17 stationary air pollution sources to comply with applicable air district rules and control
18 measures; and SCAQMD Rule 1401, which provides for the review of TAC
19 emissions via the issuance of SCAQMD air quality permits in order to evaluate
20 potential public exposure and health risk, to mitigate potentially significant health
21 risks resulting from these exposures, and to provide net health risk benefits by
22 improving the level of control when existing sources are modified or replaced.

23 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.3.10 states, "New developments shall include the
24 following requirements to reduce emissions associated with toxic air contaminants
25 (TACs):

- 26 a. Electrical outlets shall be included in the building design of any loading docks
27 to allow use by refrigerated delivery trucks. Signage shall also be installed,
28 instructing commercial vehicles to limit idling times to five minutes or less.

1 If loading and/or unloading of perishable goods would occur for more than
2 five minutes and continual refrigeration is required, all refrigerated delivery
3 trucks shall use the electrical outlets to continue powering the truck
4 refrigeration units when the delivery truck engine is turned off.

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

9 Mitigation Measure MM 3.3.11 states, “The County of Riverside shall require
10 minimum distances between potentially incompatible land uses, as described below,
11 unless a project-specific evaluation of human health risks defines, quantifies, and
12 reduces the potential incremental health risks through site design or the
13 implementation of additional reduction measures to levels below applicable
14 standards (e.g., standards recommended or required by CARB, SCAQMD or
15 MDAQMD).

16 SCAQMD Jurisdiction:

- 17 a. Proposed dry cleaners and film processing services that use
18 perchloroethylene must be sited at least 500 feet from existing sensitive land
19 uses including residential, schools, day care facilities, congregate care
20 facilities, hospitals, or other places of long-term residency for people.
21 b. Proposed auto body repair services shall be sited at least 500 feet from
22 existing sensitive land uses.
23 c. Proposed gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput of less than
24 3.6 million gallons shall be sited at least 50 feet from existing sensitive land
25 uses. Proposed gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput at or
26 above 3.6 million gallons shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing
27 sensitive land uses.
28

- 1 d. Other proposed sources of TACs, including furniture manufacturing and
2 repair services that use methylene chloride or other solvents identified as a
3 TAC, shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing sensitive land uses.
- 4 e. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing
5 freeways, major urban roadways with 100,000 vehicles per day or more, and
6 major rural roadways with 50,000 vehicles per day or more.
- 7 f. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing dry
8 cleaners and film processing services that use perchloroethylene.
- 9 g. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing auto
10 body repair services.
- 11 h. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 50 feet from existing
12 gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput of less than 3.6
13 million gallons and 300 feet from existing gasoline dispensing stations with
14 an annual throughput at or above 3.6 million gallons.
- 15 i. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing land
16 uses that use methylene chloride or other solvents identified as a TAC.

17 MDAQMD Jurisdiction:

- 18 a. Proposed industrial projects must be sited at least 1,000 feet from existing
19 sensitive land uses.
- 20 b. Proposed distribution centers with 40 or more trucks per day shall be sited at
21 least 1,000 feet from existing sensitive land uses.
- 22 c. Proposed dry cleaners using perchloroethylene shall be sited at least 500 feet
23 from existing sensitive land uses.
- 24 d. Proposed gasoline dispensing facilities shall be sited at least 300 feet from
25 existing sensitive land uses.
- 26 e. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing
27 freeways, major urban roadways with 100,000 vehicles per day or more, and
28 major rural roadways with 50,000 vehicles per day or more.

- 1 f. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 1,000 feet from existing
2 industrial facilities or distribution centers with more than 40 trucks per day.
3 g. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing dry
4 cleaners using perchloroethylene.
5 h. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing
6 gasoline dispensing stations.”

7 Determination: Future analyses of air quality impacts, in accordance with GPA 960 Policies,
8 as well as SCAQMD Rule 1401 and adherence to mitigation measures MM 3.3.10
9 and MM 3.3.11 would ensure that future sensitive receptors allowed under the
10 proposed Project would not be exposed to substantial concentrations of air toxics as
11 they include requirements to reduce emissions associated with toxic air contaminants
12 and preclude future development that cannot be mitigated to levels below SCAQMD
13 risk thresholds. As a result, this impact would be reduced to a less than cumulatively
14 considerable level.

15 4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.3.6) Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to
16 Odorous Emissions

17 Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the Project may
18 allow the construction of sensitive land uses near existing or future sources of
19 odorous emissions. Future development in the vicinity of existing agricultural uses
20 could expose future residents to agricultural odors such as manures or fertilizers.
21 While agricultural odors typically do not pose a health risk, they can still be strong
22 enough to prove a nuisance.

23 Regulations: GPA 960 policies AQ 2.1 through 2.4 (RCIP GP Policies AQ 2.1 through 2.4)
24 would reduce potential odor impacts by requiring site design considerations in new
25 development, including barriers between sources and receptors.

26 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.3.12 states, “Locate potential new odor sources
27 predominantly down- or cross-wind from existing sensitive receptors and potential
28 new sensitive receptors predominantly upwind from existing odor sources. As

1 indicated by the Right-to-Farm ordinance, agricultural uses that have been operated
2 for more than three years cannot be reclassified as a public or private nuisance by
3 new development.”

4 Mitigation measure MM 3.3.13 states, “Maintain an adequate buffer between
5 potential new odor sources and receptors such that emitted odors are dissipated
6 before reaching the receptors (minimum of 500 feet depending on odor source). As
7 indicated by the Right-to-Farm ordinance, agricultural uses that have been operated
8 for more than three years cannot be reclassified as a public or private nuisance by
9 new development.”

10 Determination: Compliance with County policies and mitigation measures MM 3.3.12 and
11 MM 3.3.13, which require that potential new sensitive receptors be located
12 predominantly upwind from existing odor sources as well as buffering of odor
13 sources and receptors, would ensure that future development resulting from the
14 proposed Project would not result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial
15 odorous emissions. As a result, this impact would be reduced to a less than
16 cumulatively considerable level.

17 C. Biological Resources

- 18 5. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.4.1) Have a substantial adverse effect,
19 either directly or through Habitat Modifications, on any Species Identified as a
20 Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species in Local or Regional Plans, Policies,
21 or Regulations, or by the California Departments of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and
22 Wildlife Service

23 The increase in density/intensity potential resulting from the proposed Project could
24 result in future high density and mixed use development that would increase
25 urbanization and potentially impact the 349 species in Riverside County that are
26 considered candidate, sensitive, or special-status under the Endangered Species Act
27 (ESA), the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), and/or a California Native
28 Plant Society (CNPS) designation. Grading and other land-disturbing activities could

1 result in direct effects to species present, particularly for ground-dwelling nocturnal
2 mammals and reptiles, amphibians, invertebrates, or plants. Indirect impacts would
3 also occur to all of these species groups, including direct secondary impacts due to
4 construction activities, such as disturbed breeding, feeding, nesting, or foraging
5 behaviors; loss of foraging habitat; loss of food sources; loss of burrows; and loss of
6 nesting or roosting habitat. Indirect harm also includes ongoing secondary impacts
7 due to human occupation, such as disturbance by human intrusion, increased
8 nighttime lighting, introduction of new species (particularly dogs and house cats) and
9 increased urban-associated predators (such as raccoons, opossums, or coyotes)
10 because of the greater availability of scavenged food sources, i.e., refuse and pet
11 foods.

12 Regulations: Depending on the location of the private or public development project, certain
13 biological studies are required for WRC-MSHCP or CV-MSHCP compliance. These
14 studies may identify the need for specific measures to avoid, minimize, and reduce
15 impacts to covered species and their habitat depending on their location. Species
16 addressed under the WRC-MSHCP and the CV-MSHCP would be adequately
17 covered by these plans to ensure that impacts to these species and their habitats would
18 be less than significant.

19 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.4.1 states, "Prior to discretionary project approval for
20 projects with the potential to substantially adversely affect sensitive (listed,
21 candidate, or special-status) species or habitats, a general biological resource
22 assessment (BRA) shall be performed. The following requirements shall apply:

- 23 a. The BRA shall be performed by a Riverside County-approved biologist
24 pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding executed between the biologist
25 and the County of Riverside.
 - 26 b. The biology/environmental firm or biologist preparing the BRA must be on
27 Riverside County's list of qualified consultants.
- 28

- 1 c. Fieldwork must be performed by qualified biologists according to
2 professional standards.
- 3 d. If included in the BRA, presence/absence surveys for specific plants must be
4 conducted during the applicable blooming season or other conditions as
5 deemed scientifically appropriate and valid.
- 6 e. Should affected species or habitat occur on the Project site, then a “Focused
7 Protocol Survey” must be prepared for those species using existing protocols
8 established by the USFWS or CDFW. If no such protocols exist, the survey
9 must be based on generally accepted biological survey protocols appropriate
10 to the species.

11 The BRA requirement may be waived if any of the following conditions are
12 documented to exist.

- 13 a. The area affected by the proposed Project (“footprint” herein) consists
14 entirely of built environment (structures, pavement, etc.) and none of the
15 biota or plant material present (i.e., landscaping) represent likely habitat used
16 by a sensitive species.
- 17 b. The Riverside County Ecological Resources Specialist (ERS) finds in writing
18 that the proposed footprint does not have any biological resources expected
19 to be used by a protected species or plant.
- 20 c. The project or activity proposed is to be performed under an existing
21 incidental take permit, habitat conservation plan or other governing permit,
22 license or authorization (i.e., Section 7 consultation) and no new significant
23 effect to the covered species or other protected species or resource is expected
24 to occur.

25 In addition to the items herein, the BRA shall also be prepared in accordance with
26 the Riverside County “Guide to Preparing General Biological Resource
27 Assessments,” as well as any other requirements of the Riverside County
28

1 Environmental Programs Department, Planning Department, or other County of
2 Riverside agency.

3 Upon receipt of the BRA, the Riverside County ERS shall review it and all
4 supporting documentation. If the Riverside County ERS finds that the Project does
5 not have the potential to substantially affect sensitive species or habitat, no further
6 mitigation is required. If the Riverside County ERS finds that the Project has the
7 potential to substantially adversely affect sensitive species or habitat, then additional
8 mitigation will be developed and imposed to reduce such impacts to below a level of
9 significance. Such mitigation may include but not be limited to obtaining incidental
10 take permits from the USFWS and/or CDFW, as applicable, and acquisition and
11 conservation of replacement habitat at appropriate ratios.”

12 Mitigation: Mitigation Measure MM 3.4.2 states, “A general biological resources
13 assessment (BRA) shall be required as part of the discretionary project review
14 process at Riverside County’s discretion. For example, a BRA would be required if
15 site inspection, aerial or other photos, resource agency data, or any other information
16 indicates potential for sensitive habitat to occur on or be adversely affected by the
17 proposed Project. The BRA shall be prepared and reviewed as per the requirements
18 outlined in mitigation measure MM 3.4.1.”

19 Determination: Future development projects would be required to provide substantial
20 evidence of compliance with the WRC-MSHCP or the CV-MSHCP (as applicable),
21 as well as payment of the development mitigation fees, during the County’s
22 development review process. With payment of the mitigation fee and compliance
23 with WRC-MSHCP or CV-MSHCP requirements, a project may be deemed
24 compliant with CEQA, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), CESA, and
25 ESA, and impacts to covered species and their habitat would be deemed less than
26 significant. For non- MSHCP areas, mitigation measures MM 3.4.1 and MM 3.4.2
27 require projects to have a Riverside County-approved biologist prepare a general
28 BRA. The measures require additional mitigation to reduce any impacts identified

1 by the BRA to below a level of significance. These compliance measures would
2 reduce impacts associated with future development accommodated by the Project to
3 less than cumulatively considerable levels, both within and outside of MSHCP areas.

4 6. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.4.2) Have a Substantial Adverse Effect on
5 any Riparian Habitat or other Sensitive Natural Community Identified in Local or
6 Regional Plans, Policies, Regulations or by the California Department of Fish and
7 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service

8 Future development facilitated by the Project could adversely affect riparian or other
9 sensitive habitats, which include those that are of special concern to resource
10 agencies and those that are protected under the multiple species habitat conservation
11 plans (MSHCP), CEQA, Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code, and
12 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Habitat may be lost or significantly altered due
13 to direct impacts as well as indirect impacts resulting from development. Direct
14 impacts are generally those in which habitat is lost to grading and filling. Indirect
15 impacts to riparian or other sensitive habitats generally occur through edge effects,
16 habitat alterations, disturbances, fragmentation, or degradation.

17 Regulations: GPA 960 Policy OS 17.2 (RCIP GP Policy OS 17.1) requires the enforcement
18 of the provisions of applicable MSHCPs when conducting review of development
19 applications. Discretionary projects that occur within the WRC-MSHCP criteria cells
20 are submitted to the County of Riverside for review and are subject to the Habitat
21 Evaluation and Acquisition and Negotiation Strategy (HANS), which ensures that
22 the sensitive habitats and riparian areas are conserved. The MSHCP also identifies
23 the requisite studies and land use considerations necessary to protect riparian areas
24 outside of the criteria cells that contribute to the function and value of the reserve
25 system and the sensitive habitats conserved therein. Pursuant to Section 6.1.2 of the
26 WRC-MSHCP, as projects are proposed within the plan area, an assessment of the
27 potentially significant effects on riparian/riverine areas and vernal pools would be
28 performed using available information augmented by project-specific mapping

1 provided to and reviewed by a Riverside County biologist. The CV-MSHCP is
2 designed to ensure conservation of covered species as well as the natural
3 communities on which they depend, including riparian habitat and other sensitive
4 habitats. To ensure necessary habitat is preserved, discretionary projects that occur
5 within its conservation areas are submitted for joint project review by the County of
6 Riverside and the Coachella Valley Conservation Commission pursuant to Section
7 6.6.1.1 of the CV-MSHCP. For proposals in the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto
8 Mountains Conservation Area, the County of Riverside employs the HANS process
9 instead. Implementation of joint project review and the HANS process ensures that
10 sensitive habitats and riparian areas are conserved pursuant to the CV-MSHCP.

11 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.4.3 states, "For sites not governed by an existing
12 MSHCP, where site conditions (e.g., topography, soils, vegetation) indicate a project
13 could adversely affect any riparian or riverine resources, an appropriate assessment
14 shall be prepared by a qualified professional. An assessment shall include, but not be
15 limited to, identification and mapping of any riparian/riverine areas and evaluation
16 of species composition, topography/hydrology and soil analysis, as applicable. An
17 assessment shall be completed as part of the environmental review for the
18 development proposal prior to its approval. Upon receipt of an assessment, the
19 Riverside County Ecological Resources Specialist (ERS) shall review the document
20 and make a finding that:

- 21 a. Riparian/riverine areas do not exist on site; or
- 22 b. Project-specific avoidance measures have been identified that would be
23 sufficient to ensure avoidance of riparian/riverine areas; or
- 24 c. Impacts to riparian/riverine areas are significant and unavoidable. If
25 avoidance is not feasible, a practicable alternative that minimizes direct and
26 indirect effects to riparian/riverine areas and vernal pools and associated
27 functions and values to the greatest extent possible must be developed.
28

1 If impacts remain significant and unavoidable, then the ERS will require the Project
2 applicant to obtain a Section 404 permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers
3 (USACE) and/or a Fish and Game Code Section 1600 agreement from the CDFW
4 prior to the issuance of any grading permit or other action by the County of Riverside
5 that would lead to the disturbance of the riparian resource.”

6 Mitigation Measure MM 3.4.4 states, “For sites not governed by an MSHCP, a
7 general biological resources assessment (BRA) shall be required as part of the
8 discretionary project review process at Riverside County’s discretion. For example,
9 a BRA would be required if site inspection, aerial or other photos, resource agency
10 data, or any other information indicates potential for sensitive habitat to occur on or
11 be adversely affected by the proposed Project. The BRA shall be prepared and
12 reviewed as per the requirements outlined in mitigation measure MM 3.4.3.”

13 Determination: Implementation of the above-listed regulations and General Plan policies
14 and, in particular, the provisions of the two MSHCPs, as well as mitigation measures
15 MM 3.4.3 and MM 3.4.4, would ensure that impacts on riparian or other sensitive
16 natural communities resulting from future development accommodated by the
17 proposed Project would be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

18 6. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.4.3) Have a Substantial Adverse Effect on
19 Federally Protected Wetlands as Defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act
20 Through Direct Removal, Filling, Hydrological Interruption, or Other Means

21 There are 470,800 acres of natural vegetation communities in unincorporated
22 Riverside County with the potential to contain federally protected wetlands.
23 Therefore, future development activities associated with the Project, including
24 clearing and grubbing, grading, paving and building for new development,
25 redevelopment and construction of roads, flood control projects, and other
26 infrastructure, could result in direct removal, fill (which essentially means placing
27 dirt into), hydrological interruption, or other disturbance to federally protected
28 wetlands.

1 Regulations: Several regulations and General Plan policies would reduce impacts to
2 federally protected wetlands. These include, but are not limited to: GPA 960 Policy
3 LU 7.7 (no similar RCIP GP Policy), which states that buffers are required to the
4 extent possible between development and watercourses, including their associated
5 habitat; GPA 960 Policy OS 5.5 (RCIP GP Policy 5.5), which requires the
6 preservation and enhancement of existing native riparian habitat and prohibits the
7 obstruction of natural watercourses as well as fencing that constricts flow across
8 watercourses and their banks; GPA 960 Policy OS 6.2 (RCIP GP Policy 6.2), which
9 seeks to preserve buffer zones around wetlands where feasible and biologically
10 appropriate; and GPA 960 Policy OS 6.1 (RCIP GP Policy 6.1) which requires
11 compliance with Clean Water Act Section 404 in terms of wetlands mitigation
12 policies.

13 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.4.5 states, "If site conditions (for example,
14 topography, soils, vegetation, etc.) indicate that the proposed Project could affect
15 riparian/riverine areas or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of
16 the CWA, then an appropriate assessment shall be prepared by a qualified
17 professional as part of Riverside County's project review process. An assessment
18 shall include, but not be limited to, identification and mapping of any wetland(s) or
19 riparian resources present; evaluation of plant species composition, topography and
20 hydrology; a soils analysis (where appropriate) and conclusions stating the presence
21 or absence of jurisdictional wetlands. An assessment shall be completed as part of
22 the development review process. Should any grading or construction be proposed
23 within or alongside the banks of the watercourse or wetland, the land divider/permit
24 holder shall provide written notification to the Riverside County Planning
25 Department that the alteration of any watercourse or wetland, located either on site
26 or on any required offsite improvement areas, complies with the U.S. Army Corp of
27 Engineers Nationwide Permit Conditions. Or, the land divider shall obtain a permit
28

1 under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Copies of any agreements shall be
2 submitted along with the notification.”

3 Mitigation Measure MM 3.4.6 states, “If site conditions (e.g., topography, soils,
4 vegetation) indicate that the proposed Project could affect riparian/riverine areas or
5 federally protected wetlands as defined by Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et seq.,
6 then an appropriate assessment shall be prepared by a qualified professional as part
7 of Riverside County’s project review process. An assessment shall include, but not
8 be limited to, identification and mapping of any wetland(s) or riparian resources
9 present; evaluation of plant species composition, topography, and hydrology; a soils
10 analysis (where appropriate); and conclusions stating the presence or absence of
11 jurisdictional wetlands. An assessment shall be completed as part of the development
12 review process.

13 Should any grading or construction be proposed within or along the banks of any
14 natural watercourse or wetland located either on-site or on any required off-site
15 improvement areas, the land divider/permit holder shall provide written notification
16 to the Riverside County Planning Department that the appropriate CDFW
17 notification pursuant to Sections 1601/1603 of the Fish and Game Code has taken
18 place. Or, the land divider shall obtain an “Agreement Regarding Proposed Stream
19 or Lake Alteration” (Section 1601/1603 Permit). Copies of any agreements shall be
20 submitted along with the notification.”

21 Determination: Compliance with the applicable MSHCP, USACE guidelines, and General
22 Plan policies, and mitigation measures MM 3.4.5 and MM 3.4.6 would ensure no net
23 loss of riparian habitat and preservation of biological function and value of any
24 jurisdictional waters on-site, as well as buffer zones. Therefore, impacts would be
25 reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

26 7. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.4.4) Interfere Substantially with the
27 Movement of any Native Resident or Migratory Fish or Wildlife Species or with
28

Established Native Resident or Migratory Wildlife Corridors, or Impede the use of
Native Wildlife Nursery Sites

Residential development has the potential to result in the creation of new barriers to animal movement in the urbanizing areas, thus adversely affecting movement, migration, wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

Regulations: Sufficient programs, including corridor conservation measures, edge effect controls, and other components of the WRC-MSHCP and CV-MSHCP would ensure that future development in western Riverside County and the Coachella Valley does not substantially interfere with wildlife movement or corridors. In addition, the MSHCPs protect native wildlife nursery sites by conserving large blocks of representative native habitats suitable for supporting species' life-cycle requirements and the essential ecological processes of species that depend on such habitats.

Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.4.7 states, "Should a wildlife nursery site or native resident or migratory wildlife corridor be uncovered through a biological resources assessment (BRA), then a consultation with a Riverside County Ecological Resources Specialist (ERS) shall occur. The ERS shall make a determination if the site is essential for the long-term viability of the species. If such a determination is made, then the ERS shall work with the Project applicant to avoid the effects of development on the resource in question and condition the land use case accordingly. Should significant impacts to a nursery site or corridor not be avoidable, the applicant shall be required to ensure the preservation of comparable nursery or corridor habitat off-site."

Determination: The protections afforded by the WRC-MSHCP and CV-MSHCP would ensure that future development accommodated by the Project would have a less than significant impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or the use of native wildlife nursery sites in western Riverside County and the Coachella Valley. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.4.7 would ensure

1 that no significant interference with wildlife movement, corridors, or nursery sites
2 would occur outside of the MSHCP areas. For these reasons, impacts would be less
3 than cumulatively considerable.

4 D. Cultural Resources

5 8. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.5.1) *Substantial Adverse Change in the*
6 *Significance of a Historical Resource*

7 Future development accommodated by the Project would increase the amount of
8 urban development and ground disturbance in the County, which could in turn cause
9 a substantial adverse cumulative change in the significance of the County's historical
10 resources, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.
11 Additionally, in previously undisturbed areas and in areas not yet formally evaluated
12 for cultural resources, ground-disturbing activities could lead to the discovery of
13 historical resources deemed significant.

14 Regulations: The applicable regulatory measures would be determined during the County's
15 development review process, and included in a project's conditions of approval.
16 Standard conditions addressing project-specific cultural resource impacts include
17 requirements for site and tribal monitoring during construction; actions to take if a
18 cultural resource is inadvertently discovered during grading/construction (e.g.,
19 halting ground disturbance until appropriate preservation or mitigation measures are
20 determined in consultation with the Native American tribal representative, the
21 archaeologist, and the Planning Director); documentation and reporting requirements
22 to verify compliance; and specific protocols to be followed for the discovery of any
23 human remains, whether modern, historic, or prehistoric (e.g., remains left in place
24 and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and their
25 disposition has been made in consultation with the Riverside County Coroner and/or
26 the Native American Heritage Commission consistent with California Health and
27 Safety Code Section 7050.5). Vacant parcels in areas known to have prehistoric or
28 historic resources, as well as any parcels with environmental, geomorphological, or

1 vegetative features known to increase the likelihood of cultural resources being
2 present, trigger a Phase I cultural resources study.

3 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.5.1 states, "Avoidance is the preferred treatment for
4 cultural resources. Where feasible, project plans shall be developed to allow
5 avoidance of cultural resources. Where avoidance of construction impacts is
6 possible, capping of the cultural resource site and avoidance planting (e.g., planting
7 of prickly pear cactus) shall be employed to ensure that indirect impacts from
8 increased public availability to the site are avoided. Where avoidance is selected,
9 cultural resource sites shall be placed within permanent conservation easements or
10 dedicated open space."

11 Determination: The regulations, procedures, and mitigation discussed above form a
12 regulatory framework to ensure that the County's historical resources are protected
13 on a comprehensive, or cumulative, level by requiring site-specific development to
14 be adequately reviewed for cultural resources prior to approval; requiring appropriate
15 mitigation measures to be developed and incorporated into project design and project
16 conditions of approval; requiring that human remains are treated in accordance with
17 applicable laws; and requiring that tribal participation occurs. Therefore, this impact
18 would be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

19 9. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.5.2) Substantial Adverse Change in the
20 Significance of an Archaeological Resource

21 Future development accommodated by the Project would increase the amount of
22 urban development and ground disturbance in the County, which could in turn cause
23 a substantial adverse cumulative change in the significance of the County's
24 archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.
25 Additionally, in previously undisturbed areas and in areas not yet formally evaluated
26 for cultural resources, ground-disturbing activities could lead to the discovery of
27 archaeological resources deemed significant.
28

1 Regulations: GPA 960 Policies OS-19.3 through OS-19.5 (RCIP GP Policies OS-19.3
2 through OS-19.5) require proposed development to be reviewed for the possibility
3 of cultural resources and for compliance with the County's cultural resources
4 program; to prioritize the protection of cultural resources preserved in place or left
5 in an undisturbed state by designating open space and allocating resources and/or tax
6 credits to the extent feasible; and to exercise sensitivity and respect for human
7 remains through compliance with all applicable laws concerning such remains. The
8 County's Planning Department has specific procedures and standard conditions of
9 approval to ensure that development projects are adequately reviewed, additional
10 information is collected where warranted, archaeological resources are identified
11 and, where significant, preserved, that any human remains uncovered are treated in
12 accordance with applicable laws and, lastly, that tribal participation occurs when
13 applicable. Vacant parcels in areas known to have prehistoric or historic resources,
14 as well as any parcels with environmental, geomorphological, or vegetative features
15 known to increase the likelihood of cultural resources being present, trigger a Phase
16 I cultural resources study and departmental procedures including review by the
17 Riverside County Archaeologist for prospective archaeological resource impacts, as
18 well as the application of additional conditions of approval as the individual project-
19 specific circumstances, Phase I cultural resources study, and any Phase II
20 archaeological testing studies dictate.

21 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.5.2 states, "If avoidance and/or preservation in place
22 of cultural resources is not feasible, the following mitigation measures shall be
23 initiated for each impacted site:

- 24 a. Discoveries shall be discussed with the Native American tribal (or other
25 appropriate ethnic/cultural group representative) and the Riverside County
26 Archaeologist, and a decision shall be made with the concurrence of the
27 Planning Director, as to the mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance,
28 etc.) appropriate for the cultural resource.

1 b. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery
2 until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to appropriate
3 preservation or mitigation measures.”

4 Determination: The regulations and procedures discussed above ensure that the County’s
5 archaeological resources are protected on a comprehensive, or cumulative, level by
6 requiring site-specific review and mitigation for archaeological resources and tribal
7 consultation. Mitigation measure MM 3.5.2 would further lessen impacts by
8 providing for dialogue with the appropriate ethnic or cultural group concerning the
9 dispensation of cultural resources where it is infeasible for those resources to be
10 avoided or preserved in place. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less than
11 cumulatively considerable level.

12 10. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.5.3) *Disturb Human Remains*

13 The proposed Project does not include components that would affect existing
14 cemeteries. However, future development accommodated by the Project would result
15 in disturbance of vacant lands, resulting in the potential to disturb buried human
16 remains interred outside of formal cemeteries, in both known and previously
17 unknown locations.

18 Regulations: The County’s Planning Department has specific procedures and standard
19 conditions of approval, including specific protocols to be followed for the discovery
20 of any human remains, whether modern, historic, or prehistoric (e.g., remains left in
21 place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and their
22 disposition has been made in consultation with the Riverside County Coroner and/or
23 the Native American Heritage Commission consistent with California Health and
24 Safety Code Section 7050.5). GPA 960 Policies OS-19.3 through OS-19.5 (RCIP GP
25 Policies OS-19.3 through OS-19.5) require proposed development to exercise
26 sensitivity and respect for human remains through compliance with all applicable
27 laws concerning such remains. California’s Traditional Tribal Places Act (SB 18)
28 requires Riverside County to consult with Native American groups at the earliest

1 of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working the project
2 area to excessive noise levels.

3 Future development accommodated by the Project may result in the exposure of new
4 noise-sensitive land uses to noise from operations at public and private airports,
5 airstrips, and helipads. Around larger public airports, noise levels can exceed
6 acceptable standards in certain areas, as shown by noise-contour maps of existing,
7 future, and ultimate buildout operational conditions for public airports.

8 Regulations: The ALUCP adopted by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
9 addresses noise-related land use constraints for the various zones surrounding
10 airports in the County. All future development proposed would be required to comply
11 with applicable Airport Land Use Commission policies, as well as with state and
12 county regulations and policies, regarding site design and building construction to
13 achieve acceptable interior and exterior noise exposure levels for habitable
14 structures.

15 Determination: Compliance with ALUCP and other applicable standards would ensure that
16 airport-related noise impacts on future development pursuant to the Project would be
17 less than cumulatively considerable.

18 J. Population and Housing

- 19 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.13.2) Displace substantial numbers of
20 existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere;
21 Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of
22 replacement housing elsewhere

23 Most of the sites identified for changes in land use designation as a result of the
24 Project are currently vacant; none contain substantial numbers of existing homes
25 whose loss would necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere. This
26 is particularly true given that the proposed Project would cumulatively result in the
27 capacity for up to 73,255 more dwelling units and 240,805 more people in the County
28 in comparison to buildout of the adopted General Plan (refer to finding for Impact

1 Analysis 3.13.1). Additionally, the Project would include text revisions to the
2 General Plan and Ordinance No. 348 that encourage multifamily development in the
3 County. Therefore, the Project would accommodate an increase in housing
4 opportunities in the County and would not displace substantial numbers of existing
5 housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
6 and the Project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact.

7 Regulations: None applicable

8 Determination: Less than cumulatively considerable

9 K. Public Services

10 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.14.1) *Increased Demand for Fire Protection*
11 *and Emergency Services*

12 The proposed project would accommodate future development of both high-density
13 residential and mixed-use development that would incrementally increase the demand
14 for fire protection and emergency services in localized areas throughout
15 unincorporated Riverside County. If these areas are built out to capacity, the
16 cumulative effect of increased fire service demand resulting from future development
17 facilitated by the Project could trigger the need for new or physically altered Riverside
18 County Fire Department (RCFD) facilities, staff, and/or equipment, including the
19 need for up to 37 new RCFD fire stations ($73,255 \text{ du} / 2,000 \text{ du} = 37 \text{ stations}$) beyond
20 those already anticipated for buildout of current land use designations.

21 Regulations: During the development review process, all future development would be
22 subject to review by both the RCFD and the Riverside County Department of Building
23 and Safety, both of which enforce fire standards including the Uniform Fire Code,
24 PRC Sections 4290–4299, and California Government Code section 51178. In
25 addition, the County requires all new structures in unincorporated areas to comply
26 with the construction requirements of the California Building and Fire Codes, which
27 include minimum standards for access, fire flow, building ignition and fire resistance,
28 fire protection systems and equipment, defensible space, and setback requirements.

County Ordinance No. 787 includes requirements for high-occupancy structures to further protect people and structures from fire risks, including requirements that buildings not impede emergency egress for fire safety personnel and that equipment and apparatus not hinder evacuation from fire, such as potentially blocking stairways or fire doors. GPA 960 Policies LU 5.1 and 5.2 (RCIP GP Policies LU 5.1 and LU 5.2) prohibit new development from exceeding the ability to adequately provide supporting infrastructure and services, including fire protection services, and GPA 960 Policy S 5.1 (RCIP GP Policy S 5.1) requires proposed development to incorporate fire prevention features. Finally, in order to ensure adequate services, the County requires new development to pay fire protection mitigation fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 659. These fees are used by the RCFD to construct new fire protection facilities or to provide facilities in lieu of the fee as approved by the RCFD.

Determination: As future development in the County would be required to contribute its fair share to fund fire facilities via fire protection mitigation fees, construction of any RCFD facilities would be subject to CEQA review, and compliance with existing regulations would reduce the impacts of providing fire protection services concurrent with new development, the increase in density/intensity potential associated with the Project would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts associated with the provision of fire protection and emergency services.

2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.14.2) Increased Demand for Law Enforcement Services

The proposed Project would accommodate future development of both high-density residential and mixed-use development that would incrementally increase the demand for law enforcement services in localized areas throughout unincorporated Riverside County. If areas are built out to capacity, the cumulative effect of increased law enforcement service demand resulting from future development facilitated by the Project could trigger the need for new or physically altered Riverside County Sheriff's Department (RCSD) facilities, staff, and/or equipment, including the need for up to

1 361 sworn police officers, 52 supervisors, 52 support staff, and 120 patrol vehicles
2 beyond what has been anticipated for buildout of the current General Plan (refer to
3 Table 3.14-4 of the Draft EIR).

4 Regulations: GPA 960 Policies LU 5.1 and 5.2 (RCIP GP Policies LU 5.1 and LU 5.2)
5 prohibit new development from exceeding the ability to adequately provide
6 supporting infrastructure and services, including law enforcement services. Pursuant
7 to Ordinance No. 659, the County requires the development applicant to pay the
8 RCSD an established development mitigation fee prior to issuance of a certificate of
9 occupancy on any structure as each is developed. The fees are for the acquisition and
10 construction of public facilities.

11 Determination: Future development facilitated by the Project would be reviewed by the
12 RCSD for the provision of adequate services, and additional officers and facilities
13 would be funded through payment of mitigation fees and taxes. Furthermore, any
14 facilities needed would be subject to project-specific CEQA review. Therefore,
15 impacts associated with the provision of law enforcement services would be less than
16 cumulatively considerable.

17 3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.14.3) Increased Demand for Public School
18 Facilities

19 Based on student generation rates used by Riverside County to represent the number
20 of students, or the portion thereof, expected to attend district schools from each new
21 dwelling unit, full buildout of future development accommodated by the proposed
22 Project would be expected to result in up to 59,775 additional students in Riverside
23 County beyond what has been anticipated (refer to Table 3.14-5 in the Draft EIR).
24 This would result in the need for additional classroom space and teaching and support
25 staff where increases exceed current capacity. Where increases trigger new school
26 facilities or expansion of existing facilities, environmental impacts could potentially
27 occur.
28

1 Regulations: Pursuant to the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act (SB 50), future
2 development would be required to pay residential and commercial/industrial
3 development mitigation fees to fund school construction. Under CEQA, payment of
4 development fees is considered to provide full mitigation for the impact of a proposed
5 project on public schools.

6 Determination: Expansion of an existing school or construction of a new school would have
7 environmental impacts that would need to be addressed once the school improvements
8 are proposed. It is likely that growth associated with the Project will occur over time,
9 which means that any one development is unlikely to result in the need to construct
10 school improvements. Instead, each future development project will pay its share of
11 future school improvement costs prior to occupancy of the building. As stated above,
12 payment of development fees is considered to provide full mitigation for the impact
13 of a proposed project on public schools under CEQA.

14 L. Parks and Recreation

15 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.15.1) *Increased Demand for Park and*
16 *Recreation Facilities*

17 The incremental increase of people associated with the Project would be spread over
18 the entire County in various amounts. The specific environmental impacts resulting
19 from the provision of parks and recreational facilities would be identified by project-
20 level environmental review of those future park facilities. Therefore, this impact
21 would be less than cumulatively considerable.

22 Regulations: Growth instigated by the proposed Project would generate an incremental net
23 increase in park needs, i.e., increase the number of people using existing recreational
24 resources and necessitate the provision of new facilities to maintain adequate levels
25 of service, pursuant to the County's parkland standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population
26 (GPA 960 Policy LU 25.4/RCIP GP Policy LU 19.4).

27 Determination: Less than cumulatively considerable

28 M. Transportation/Traffic

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.16.2) Result in a Change in Air Traffic Patterns, Including either an Increase in Traffic Levels or a Change in Location that Results in Substantial Safety Risks

Palm Springs International Airport is the only airport in Riverside County that has regularly scheduled commercial passenger flights and any future development facilitated by the Project would be reviewed for consistency with the ALUCP, which would ensure that airport operations, including air traffic patterns, would not be affected. Therefore, this impact is considered less than cumulatively considerable

2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.16.3) Substantially Increase Hazards Due To A Design Feature Or Incompatible Uses

The proposed project would accommodate future development of both high-density residential and mixed-use development, which could result in the need for additional transportation and circulation infrastructure throughout the County. If not constructed according to the appropriate design criteria, hazards could occur.

Regulations: Implementation of and compliance with current regulations and Riverside

County General Plan policies would ensure that traffic hazards are either avoided or minimized to less than significant. They include but are not limited to the following: Riverside County Transportation Department Improvement Standards and Specifications (County Ordinance No. 461), as well as to Caltrans Standard Plans and Specifications, which include roadway design criteria to ensure that improvements would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses; GPA 960 Policy C 3.4 (RCIP GP Policy C 3.4), which allows Riverside County to use a variety of design techniques such as continuous flow intersections, provided that a detailed study has been completed showing that these facilities could improve safety; GPA 960 Policy C 3.23 (RCIP GP Policy C 3.23), which directs Riverside County to consider the use of traffic-calming techniques to improve safety in neighborhoods; and GPA 960 Policy C 6.5 (RCIP GP Policy C

6.5), which recommends the placement of access locations for properties to maximize safety.

Determination: The proposed Project does not include components that would substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses and the above regulations would ensure future development would not substantially increase hazards. For these reasons, impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable.

3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.16.4) *Emergency Access*

The proposed project would accommodate future development of both high-density residential and mixed-use development, which would require coordinated emergency access.

Regulations: Implementation of and compliance with Riverside County General Plan policies would ensure that significant impacts associated with the provision of emergency access are either avoided or minimized to less than significant, including but not limited to the following: GPA 960 Policy C 3.24 (RCIP GP Policy C 3.24), which requires the County to consult with the Fire Department and other emergency service providers in order to provide a street network with quick and efficient routes for emergency vehicles, meeting necessary street widths, turnaround radius, secondary access, and other factors as determined by the Transportation Department.

Determination: The General Plan policy above would ensure the provision of adequate emergency access in street networks for new development. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.16.5) *Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Public Transit, Bicycle, or Pedestrian Facilities, or Otherwise Decrease the Performance or Safety of such Facilities*

Future development accommodated by the Project could result in a cumulative increase in the demand for public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

Regulations: Implementation of and compliance with Riverside County General Plan policies promote the provision of alternative transportation facilities, including but

not limited to the following policies: GPA 960/RCIP GP Policies C 4.1 through 4.4, which address the provision of safe pedestrian access in new development and roadway projects, specifically requiring that project design include pedestrian access from developments to existing and future transit routes (C 4.3); GPA 960 Policy C 4.6 (RCIP GP Policy C 4.6), which states that the County of Riverside can require that development proposals provide pedestrian facilities as a condition of approval; and GPA 960/RCIP GP Policies C 11.1 through 11.5, which address the provision of transit facilities and/or transit access, including requirements for transit right-of-way (C 11.1) and incentives for new development to encourage location in a transit-oriented area (C 11.4).

Determination: Compliance with the above listed General Plan policies would ensure that the Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Therefore, this impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.

N. Utilities and Service Systems

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.17.3) Increased Demand for Park and Recreation Facilities

The proposed project would accommodate increased density/intensity throughout the unincorporated County, which has the potential to increase the number of people and structures generating wastewater. This growth would incrementally increase the amount of wastewater generated, which could require additional wastewater treatment capacity to serve projected demand as well as additional wastewater treatment facilities. Using the average wastewater generation rate for a residential unit in Riverside County of 230 gallons per day per capita, future development from the Project could result in the cumulative generation of 55.38 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater beyond that anticipated under buildout of the General Plan. The

1 need for specific facilities/capacity is determined through subsequent development
2 review performed at the time of implementing project review.

3 Regulations: Ordinance No. 659, DIF Program, is intended to mitigate growth impacts in
4 Riverside County by ensuring fees are collected and expended to provide necessary
5 facilities commensurate with the ongoing levels of development, including any
6 potential future expansion wastewater treatment facilities. Future development
7 would also be subject to Riverside County Ordinance No. 592, Regulating Sewer
8 Use, Sewer Construction and Industrial Wastewater Discharges in County Service
9 Areas, which sets various standards for sewer use, construction, and industrial
10 wastewater discharges to protect both water quality and the infrastructure conveying
11 and treating wastewater by establishing construction requirements for sewers,
12 laterals, house connections, and other sewerage facilities, and by prohibiting the
13 discharge to any public sewer (which directly or indirectly connects to Riverside
14 County's sewage system) any wastes that may have an adverse or harmful effect on
15 sewers, maintenance personnel, wastewater treatment plant personnel or equipment,
16 treatment plant effluent quality, or public or private property or which may otherwise
17 endanger the public or the local environment or create a public nuisance. As a result,
18 this ordinance serves to protect water supplies, water and wastewater facilities, and
19 water quality for both surface water and groundwater. In addition, increased demand
20 resulting from the Project would likely occur incrementally as the result of many
21 individual implemented projects scattered across the unincorporated County over a
22 period of many years.

23 Determination: Therefore, it is feasible that wastewater service providers in Riverside
24 County would continue to expand their treatment capacities consistent with demand.
25 Conservation methods and the increased use of reclaimed water would help decrease
26 the need for treatment and storage capacity and provide for beneficial reuse of water.
27 Also, the construction of additional wastewater treatment plants, as well as water
28 reclamation and storage facilities, would be subject to additional environmental

analysis to determine on-site impacts. For these reasons, this impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.

O. Energy Consumption

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.18.1) *Use of Fuel or Energy in Wasteful Manner*

Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the proposed Project could result in the use of fuel or energy in a wasteful manner. The increase in electricity usage as a result of the Project would constitute an approximate 3.9 percent increase in the typical annual electricity consumption and an approximate 4.0 percent increase in the typical annual natural gas consumption attributable to all residential buildings in Riverside County (refer to Table 3.18-4 in the Draft EIR). The increase in automotive fuel would increase use in the County by 3.9 percent.

Regulations: The residential development allowed under the proposed Project would be required to comply with Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which provide minimum efficiency standards related to various building features, including appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment, building insulation and roofing, and lighting. Implementation of the Title 24 standards significantly reduces energy usage. Furthermore, the electricity provider, SCE, is subject to California's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS). The RPS requires investor-owned utilities, electric service providers, and community choice aggregators to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources to 33 percent of total procurement by 2020 and to 50 percent of total procurement by 2030.

Determination: For the reasons described above, the proposed Project would not place a substantial demand on regional energy supply or require significant additional capacity, or significantly increase peak and base period electricity demand, or cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during project construction, operation, and/or maintenance, or preempt future energy development

1 or future energy conservation. Therefore, this impact would be less than
2 cumulatively considerable.

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

12 A. Aesthetics

13 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.1.1) Have a Substantial Adverse Effect on
14 a Scenic Vista

15 The new R-7 and Mixed Use zone classifications resulting from the Project allow
16 buildings and structures up to 50 feet in height, which would represent an increase
17 in height beyond that previously considered for development in Riverside County,
18 and could thus create adverse effects to scenic vistas by altering panoramic views to
19 more urban, higher-density development with views partially obscured by structures.

20 Regulations: Compliance with General Plan policies governing the visual impact of new
21 development would reduce impacts related to substantial adverse effects on scenic
22 vistas. These include, but are not limited to, the following: GPA 960 Policy LU 4.1
23 (RCIP GP Policy LU 4.1), which requires new developments to be located and
24 designed to visually enhance and not degrade the character of the surrounding area;
25 and GPA 960 Policy LU 14.8 (RCIP GP Policy LU 13.8), which prohibits the
26 blocking of public views by solid walls.

27 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.1.1 states, "Development projects shall be subject to
28 the requirements of all relevant guidelines, including the community center

1 guidelines, Riverside County supervisorial district guidelines and all applicable
2 standards, policies, and/or regulations of the County of Riverside or other affected
3 entities pertaining to scenic vistas and aesthetic resources. Factors considered in
4 these guidelines include the scale, extent, height, bulk or intensity of development;
5 the location of development; the type, style and intensity of adjacent land uses; the
6 manner and method of construction, including materials, coatings, and landscaping;
7 the interim and/or final use of the development; the type, location, and manner of
8 illumination and signage; the nature and extent of terrain modification required; and
9 the potential effects to the established visual characteristic of the Project site and
10 identified scenic vista or aesthetic resource.”

11 Determination: Compliance with General Plan policies, plus mitigation measure MM 3.1.1,
12 would ensure that future development accommodated by the Project would have a
13 less than cumulatively considerable impact on scenic vistas by ensuring that issues
14 are analyzed and addressed during the development review process and that
15 buildings would be sited and set back such that identified scenic vistas would be
16 protected to the extent feasible. Therefore, impacts would be reduced to a less than
17 cumulatively considerable level.

18 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.1.2) Substantially Damage Scenic
19 Resources, Including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and Historic
20 Buildings within a State Scenic Highway

21 Future development under the Project would include apartments and condominiums,
22 multistory (3+) structures, and mixed-use development located primarily along
23 major transportation corridors; this development could cumulatively impact scenic
24 resources within a state scenic highway.

25 Regulations: Compliance with General Plan policies governing the visual impact of new
26 development would reduce impacts to scenic resources within state scenic highways.
27 These include, but are not limited to, the following: GPA 960 Policy LU 4.1 (RCIP
28 GP Policy LU 4.1), which requires new developments to be located and designed to

visually enhance and not degrade the character of the surrounding area; and GPA 960 Policies OS 22.1 and OS 22.4 (RCIP GP Policies OS 22.1 and OS 22.4), which directly regulate development within scenic highway corridors, requiring that developments within designated scenic highway corridors be designed to balance the objectives of maintaining scenic resources with accommodating compatible land uses and that conditions be placed on development within scenic highway corridors requiring dedication of scenic easements when necessary to preserve unique or special visual features.

Mitigation: Similar to Impact Analysis 3.1.1 discussed above, compliance with mitigation measure MM 3.1.1 would ensure that potential effects to identified aesthetic resources, including those within a scenic highway corridor, would be addressed during the development review process.

Determination: Compliance with these regulatory measures and mitigation measures MM 3.1.1 would ensure that scenic resources within the County's scenic highway corridors would be protected during future development activities and would reduce cumulative impacts to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.1.3) *Substantially degrade the existing Visual Character or Quality of the Site and its Surroundings*

Future development under the Project could include apartments and condominiums, multistory (3+) structures, and mixed-use development. The new R-7 and Mixed Use zone classifications allow buildings and structures up to 50 feet in height, minimum front and rear setbacks of 10 feet for buildings that do not exceed 35 feet in height, and side yard setbacks of 5 feet for buildings that do not exceed 35 feet in height. This development would represent an increase in density, massing, and height beyond that originally considered and could alter the existing visual character of Riverside County.

Regulations: Several local regulations and General Plan policies would reduce impacts related to substantial adverse effects on the visual character of the area. These

1 include, but are not limited to, the following: GPA 960 Policy LU 4.1 (RCIP GP
2 Policy LU 4.1), which requires new developments to be located and designed to
3 visually enhance and not degrade the character of the surrounding area; and the
4 Countywide Design Standards and Guidelines, which include requirements that
5 address scale, intensity, architectural design, landscaping, sidewalks, trails,
6 community logo, signage, and other visual design features, as well as standards for
7 backlighting and indirect lighting to promote “night skies.” Typical design
8 modifications would include stepped setbacks for multistory buildings, increased
9 landscaping, decorative walls and roof design, and themed signage.

10 Mitigation: For the similar reasons as for Impacts 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, mitigation measure MM
11 3.1.1 also applies here. The measure confirms that development projects are subject
12 to County requirements pertaining to aesthetic resources, including regulations on
13 the scale, extent, height, bulk, or intensity of development; the location of
14 development; the type, style, and intensity of adjacent land uses; the manner and
15 method of construction, including materials, coatings, and landscaping; the interim
16 and/or final use of the development; the type, location, and manner of illumination
17 and signage; the nature and extent of terrain modification required; and the potential
18 effects to the established visual characteristic of the Project site and identified scenic
19 vista or aesthetic resource.

20 Determination: Regardless of a development’s specific location in the County, regulatory
21 compliance measures, as well as mitigation measure MM 3.1.1 as discussed below,
22 would ensure that the potential aesthetic impacts of all new development proposals
23 would be analyzed and addressed during the development review process and would
24 therefore be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

25 B. Air Quality

26 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.3.5) Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to
27 Substantial Toxic Emissions
28

1 Future development accommodated by the Project could potentially include short-
2 term construction sources and long-term operational sources of toxic air
3 contaminants (TACs), including stationary and mobile sources. The degree of
4 impact would depend on the type of operation, distance from sensitive receptors, and
5 the level of activity at each site.

6 Regulations: Several regulations and General Plan policies would reduce impacts related to
7 substantial toxic emissions. These include, but are not limited to, the following: GPA
8 960 Policy AQ 4.7 (RCIP GP Policy AQ 4.7), which states that to the greatest extent
9 possible, every project is required to mitigate any of its anticipated emissions that
10 exceed allowable emission thresholds; GPA 960 Policy AQ 2.2 (RCIP GP Policy AQ
11 2.2), which requires site plan designs to protect people and land uses sensitive to air
12 pollution through the use of barriers and/or distance from emissions sources when
13 possible; GPA 960 Policy AQ 4.5, which requires stationary pollution sources to
14 minimize the release of toxic pollutants through design features, operating
15 procedures, preventive maintenance, operator training, and emergency response
16 planning; GPA 960 Policy AQ 4.6 (RCIP GP Policy AQ 4.6), which requires
17 stationary air pollution sources to comply with applicable air district rules and control
18 measures; and SCAQMD Rule 1401, which provides for the review of TAC
19 emissions via the issuance of SCAQMD air quality permits in order to evaluate
20 potential public exposure and health risk, to mitigate potentially significant health
21 risks resulting from these exposures, and to provide net health risk benefits by
22 improving the level of control when existing sources are modified or replaced.

23 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.3.10 states, "New developments shall include the
24 following requirements to reduce emissions associated with toxic air contaminants
25 (TACs):

- 26 a. Electrical outlets shall be included in the building design of any loading docks
27 to allow use by refrigerated delivery trucks. Signage shall also be installed,
28 instructing commercial vehicles to limit idling times to five minutes or less.

1 If loading and/or unloading of perishable goods would occur for more than
2 five minutes and continual refrigeration is required, all refrigerated delivery
3 trucks shall use the electrical outlets to continue powering the truck
4 refrigeration units when the delivery truck engine is turned off.

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

9 Mitigation Measure MM 3.3.11 states, “The County of Riverside shall require
10 minimum distances between potentially incompatible land uses, as described below,
11 unless a project-specific evaluation of human health risks defines, quantifies, and
12 reduces the potential incremental health risks through site design or the
13 implementation of additional reduction measures to levels below applicable
14 standards (e.g., standards recommended or required by CARB, SCAQMD or
15 MDAQMD).

16 SCAQMD Jurisdiction:

- 17 a. Proposed dry cleaners and film processing services that use
18 perchloroethylene must be sited at least 500 feet from existing sensitive land
19 uses including residential, schools, day care facilities, congregate care
20 facilities, hospitals, or other places of long-term residency for people.
21 b. Proposed auto body repair services shall be sited at least 500 feet from
22 existing sensitive land uses.
23 c. Proposed gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput of less than
24 3.6 million gallons shall be sited at least 50 feet from existing sensitive land
25 uses. Proposed gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput at or
26 above 3.6 million gallons shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing
27 sensitive land uses.
28

- 1 d. Other proposed sources of TACs, including furniture manufacturing and
2 repair services that use methylene chloride or other solvents identified as a
3 TAC, shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing sensitive land uses.
- 4 e. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing
5 freeways, major urban roadways with 100,000 vehicles per day or more, and
6 major rural roadways with 50,000 vehicles per day or more.
- 7 f. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing dry
8 cleaners and film processing services that use perchloroethylene.
- 9 g. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing auto
10 body repair services.
- 11 h. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 50 feet from existing
12 gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput of less than 3.6
13 million gallons and 300 feet from existing gasoline dispensing stations with
14 an annual throughput at or above 3.6 million gallons.
- 15 i. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing land
16 uses that use methylene chloride or other solvents identified as a TAC.

17 MDAQMD Jurisdiction:

- 18 a. Proposed industrial projects must be sited at least 1,000 feet from existing
19 sensitive land uses.
- 20 b. Proposed distribution centers with 40 or more trucks per day shall be sited at
21 least 1,000 feet from existing sensitive land uses.
- 22 c. Proposed dry cleaners using perchloroethylene shall be sited at least 500 feet
23 from existing sensitive land uses.
- 24 d. Proposed gasoline dispensing facilities shall be sited at least 300 feet from
25 existing sensitive land uses.
- 26 e. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing
27 freeways, major urban roadways with 100,000 vehicles per day or more, and
28 major rural roadways with 50,000 vehicles per day or more.

- 1 f. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 1,000 feet from existing
2 industrial facilities or distribution centers with more than 40 trucks per day.
3 g. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing dry
4 cleaners using perchloroethylene.
5 h. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing
6 gasoline dispensing stations.”

7 Determination: Future analyses of air quality impacts, in accordance with GPA 960 Policies,
8 as well as SCAQMD Rule 1401 and adherence to mitigation measures MM 3.3.10
9 and MM 3.3.11 would ensure that future sensitive receptors allowed under the
10 proposed Project would not be exposed to substantial concentrations of air toxics as
11 they include requirements to reduce emissions associated with toxic air contaminants
12 and preclude future development that cannot be mitigated to levels below SCAQMD
13 risk thresholds. As a result, this impact would be reduced to a less than cumulatively
14 considerable level.

15 4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.3.6) Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to
16 Odorous Emissions

17 Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the Project may
18 allow the construction of sensitive land uses near existing or future sources of
19 odorous emissions. Future development in the vicinity of existing agricultural uses
20 could expose future residents to agricultural odors such as manures or fertilizers.
21 While agricultural odors typically do not pose a health risk, they can still be strong
22 enough to prove a nuisance.

23 Regulations: GPA 960 policies AQ 2.1 through 2.4 (RCIP GP Policies AQ 2.1 through 2.4)
24 would reduce potential odor impacts by requiring site design considerations in new
25 development, including barriers between sources and receptors.

26 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.3.12 states, “Locate potential new odor sources
27 predominantly down- or cross-wind from existing sensitive receptors and potential
28 new sensitive receptors predominantly upwind from existing odor sources. As

1 indicated by the Right-to-Farm ordinance, agricultural uses that have been operated
2 for more than three years cannot be reclassified as a public or private nuisance by
3 new development.”

4 Mitigation measure MM 3.3.13 states, “Maintain an adequate buffer between
5 potential new odor sources and receptors such that emitted odors are dissipated
6 before reaching the receptors (minimum of 500 feet depending on odor source). As
7 indicated by the Right-to-Farm ordinance, agricultural uses that have been operated
8 for more than three years cannot be reclassified as a public or private nuisance by
9 new development.”

10 Determination: Compliance with County policies and mitigation measures MM 3.3.12 and
11 MM 3.3.13, which require that potential new sensitive receptors be located
12 predominantly upwind from existing odor sources as well as buffering of odor
13 sources and receptors, would ensure that future development resulting from the
14 proposed Project would not result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial
15 odorous emissions. As a result, this impact would be reduced to a less than
16 cumulatively considerable level.

17 C. Biological Resources

- 18 5. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.4.1) Have a substantial adverse effect,
19 either directly or through Habitat Modifications, on any Species Identified as a
20 Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species in Local or Regional Plans, Policies,
21 or Regulations, or by the California Departments of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and
22 Wildlife Service

23 The increase in density/intensity potential resulting from the proposed Project could
24 result in future high density and mixed use development that would increase
25 urbanization and potentially impact the 349 species in Riverside County that are
26 considered candidate, sensitive, or special-status under the Endangered Species Act
27 (ESA), the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), and/or a California Native
28 Plant Society (CNPS) designation. Grading and other land-disturbing activities could

1 result in direct effects to species present, particularly for ground-dwelling nocturnal
2 mammals and reptiles, amphibians, invertebrates, or plants. Indirect impacts would
3 also occur to all of these species groups, including direct secondary impacts due to
4 construction activities, such as disturbed breeding, feeding, nesting, or foraging
5 behaviors; loss of foraging habitat; loss of food sources; loss of burrows; and loss of
6 nesting or roosting habitat. Indirect harm also includes ongoing secondary impacts
7 due to human occupation, such as disturbance by human intrusion, increased
8 nighttime lighting, introduction of new species (particularly dogs and house cats) and
9 increased urban-associated predators (such as raccoons, opossums, or coyotes)
10 because of the greater availability of scavenged food sources, i.e., refuse and pet
11 foods.

12 Regulations: Depending on the location of the private or public development project, certain
13 biological studies are required for WRC-MSHCP or CV-MSHCP compliance. These
14 studies may identify the need for specific measures to avoid, minimize, and reduce
15 impacts to covered species and their habitat depending on their location. Species
16 addressed under the WRC-MSHCP and the CV-MSHCP would be adequately
17 covered by these plans to ensure that impacts to these species and their habitats would
18 be less than significant.

19 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.4.1 states, "Prior to discretionary project approval for
20 projects with the potential to substantially adversely affect sensitive (listed,
21 candidate, or special-status) species or habitats, a general biological resource
22 assessment (BRA) shall be performed. The following requirements shall apply:

- 23 a. The BRA shall be performed by a Riverside County-approved biologist
24 pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding executed between the biologist
25 and the County of Riverside.
 - 26 b. The biology/environmental firm or biologist preparing the BRA must be on
27 Riverside County's list of qualified consultants.
- 28

- 1 c. Fieldwork must be performed by qualified biologists according to
2 professional standards.
- 3 d. If included in the BRA, presence/absence surveys for specific plants must be
4 conducted during the applicable blooming season or other conditions as
5 deemed scientifically appropriate and valid.
- 6 e. Should affected species or habitat occur on the Project site, then a “Focused
7 Protocol Survey” must be prepared for those species using existing protocols
8 established by the USFWS or CDFW. If no such protocols exist, the survey
9 must be based on generally accepted biological survey protocols appropriate
10 to the species.

11 The BRA requirement may be waived if any of the following conditions are
12 documented to exist.

- 13 a. The area affected by the proposed Project (“footprint” herein) consists
14 entirely of built environment (structures, pavement, etc.) and none of the
15 biota or plant material present (i.e., landscaping) represent likely habitat used
16 by a sensitive species.
- 17 b. The Riverside County Ecological Resources Specialist (ERS) finds in writing
18 that the proposed footprint does not have any biological resources expected
19 to be used by a protected species or plant.
- 20 c. The project or activity proposed is to be performed under an existing
21 incidental take permit, habitat conservation plan or other governing permit,
22 license or authorization (i.e., Section 7 consultation) and no new significant
23 effect to the covered species or other protected species or resource is expected
24 to occur.

25 In addition to the items herein, the BRA shall also be prepared in accordance with
26 the Riverside County “Guide to Preparing General Biological Resource
27 Assessments,” as well as any other requirements of the Riverside County
28

1 Environmental Programs Department, Planning Department, or other County of
2 Riverside agency.

3 Upon receipt of the BRA, the Riverside County ERS shall review it and all
4 supporting documentation. If the Riverside County ERS finds that the Project does
5 not have the potential to substantially affect sensitive species or habitat, no further
6 mitigation is required. If the Riverside County ERS finds that the Project has the
7 potential to substantially adversely affect sensitive species or habitat, then additional
8 mitigation will be developed and imposed to reduce such impacts to below a level of
9 significance. Such mitigation may include but not be limited to obtaining incidental
10 take permits from the USFWS and/or CDFW, as applicable, and acquisition and
11 conservation of replacement habitat at appropriate ratios.”

12 Mitigation: Mitigation Measure MM 3.4.2 states, “A general biological resources
13 assessment (BRA) shall be required as part of the discretionary project review
14 process at Riverside County’s discretion. For example, a BRA would be required if
15 site inspection, aerial or other photos, resource agency data, or any other information
16 indicates potential for sensitive habitat to occur on or be adversely affected by the
17 proposed Project. The BRA shall be prepared and reviewed as per the requirements
18 outlined in mitigation measure MM 3.4.1.”

19 Determination: Future development projects would be required to provide substantial
20 evidence of compliance with the WRC-MSHCP or the CV-MSHCP (as applicable),
21 as well as payment of the development mitigation fees, during the County’s
22 development review process. With payment of the mitigation fee and compliance
23 with WRC-MSHCP or CV-MSHCP requirements, a project may be deemed
24 compliant with CEQA, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), CESA, and
25 ESA, and impacts to covered species and their habitat would be deemed less than
26 significant. For non- MSHCP areas, mitigation measures MM 3.4.1 and MM 3.4.2
27 require projects to have a Riverside County-approved biologist prepare a general
28 BRA. The measures require additional mitigation to reduce any impacts identified

1 by the BRA to below a level of significance. These compliance measures would
2 reduce impacts associated with future development accommodated by the Project to
3 less than cumulatively considerable levels, both within and outside of MSHCP areas.

4 6. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.4.2) Have a Substantial Adverse Effect on
5 any Riparian Habitat or other Sensitive Natural Community Identified in Local or
6 Regional Plans, Policies, Regulations or by the California Department of Fish and
7 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service

8 Future development facilitated by the Project could adversely affect riparian or other
9 sensitive habitats, which include those that are of special concern to resource
10 agencies and those that are protected under the multiple species habitat conservation
11 plans (MSHCP), CEQA, Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code, and
12 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Habitat may be lost or significantly altered due
13 to direct impacts as well as indirect impacts resulting from development. Direct
14 impacts are generally those in which habitat is lost to grading and filling. Indirect
15 impacts to riparian or other sensitive habitats generally occur through edge effects,
16 habitat alterations, disturbances, fragmentation, or degradation.

17 Regulations: GPA 960 Policy OS 17.2 (RCIP GP Policy OS 17.1) requires the enforcement
18 of the provisions of applicable MSHCPs when conducting review of development
19 applications. Discretionary projects that occur within the WRC-MSHCP criteria cells
20 are submitted to the County of Riverside for review and are subject to the Habitat
21 Evaluation and Acquisition and Negotiation Strategy (HANS), which ensures that
22 the sensitive habitats and riparian areas are conserved. The MSHCP also identifies
23 the requisite studies and land use considerations necessary to protect riparian areas
24 outside of the criteria cells that contribute to the function and value of the reserve
25 system and the sensitive habitats conserved therein. Pursuant to Section 6.1.2 of the
26 WRC-MSHCP, as projects are proposed within the plan area, an assessment of the
27 potentially significant effects on riparian/riverine areas and vernal pools would be
28 performed using available information augmented by project-specific mapping

1 provided to and reviewed by a Riverside County biologist. The CV-MSHCP is
2 designed to ensure conservation of covered species as well as the natural
3 communities on which they depend, including riparian habitat and other sensitive
4 habitats. To ensure necessary habitat is preserved, discretionary projects that occur
5 within its conservation areas are submitted for joint project review by the County of
6 Riverside and the Coachella Valley Conservation Commission pursuant to Section
7 6.6.1.1 of the CV-MSHCP. For proposals in the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto
8 Mountains Conservation Area, the County of Riverside employs the HANS process
9 instead. Implementation of joint project review and the HANS process ensures that
10 sensitive habitats and riparian areas are conserved pursuant to the CV-MSHCP.

11 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.4.3 states, "For sites not governed by an existing
12 MSHCP, where site conditions (e.g., topography, soils, vegetation) indicate a project
13 could adversely affect any riparian or riverine resources, an appropriate assessment
14 shall be prepared by a qualified professional. An assessment shall include, but not be
15 limited to, identification and mapping of any riparian/riverine areas and evaluation
16 of species composition, topography/hydrology and soil analysis, as applicable. An
17 assessment shall be completed as part of the environmental review for the
18 development proposal prior to its approval. Upon receipt of an assessment, the
19 Riverside County Ecological Resources Specialist (ERS) shall review the document
20 and make a finding that:

- 21 a. Riparian/riverine areas do not exist on site; or
- 22 b. Project-specific avoidance measures have been identified that would be
23 sufficient to ensure avoidance of riparian/riverine areas; or
- 24 c. Impacts to riparian/riverine areas are significant and unavoidable. If
25 avoidance is not feasible, a practicable alternative that minimizes direct and
26 indirect effects to riparian/riverine areas and vernal pools and associated
27 functions and values to the greatest extent possible must be developed.
28

1 If impacts remain significant and unavoidable, then the ERS will require the Project
2 applicant to obtain a Section 404 permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers
3 (USACE) and/or a Fish and Game Code Section 1600 agreement from the CDFW
4 prior to the issuance of any grading permit or other action by the County of Riverside
5 that would lead to the disturbance of the riparian resource.”

6 Mitigation Measure MM 3.4.4 states, “For sites not governed by an MSHCP, a
7 general biological resources assessment (BRA) shall be required as part of the
8 discretionary project review process at Riverside County’s discretion. For example,
9 a BRA would be required if site inspection, aerial or other photos, resource agency
10 data, or any other information indicates potential for sensitive habitat to occur on or
11 be adversely affected by the proposed Project. The BRA shall be prepared and
12 reviewed as per the requirements outlined in mitigation measure MM 3.4.3.”

13 Determination: Implementation of the above-listed regulations and General Plan policies
14 and, in particular, the provisions of the two MSHCPs, as well as mitigation measures
15 MM 3.4.3 and MM 3.4.4, would ensure that impacts on riparian or other sensitive
16 natural communities resulting from future development accommodated by the
17 proposed Project would be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

18 6. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.4.3) Have a Substantial Adverse Effect on
19 Federally Protected Wetlands as Defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act
20 Through Direct Removal, Filling, Hydrological Interruption, or Other Means

21 There are 470,800 acres of natural vegetation communities in unincorporated
22 Riverside County with the potential to contain federally protected wetlands.
23 Therefore, future development activities associated with the Project, including
24 clearing and grubbing, grading, paving and building for new development,
25 redevelopment and construction of roads, flood control projects, and other
26 infrastructure, could result in direct removal, fill (which essentially means placing
27 dirt into), hydrological interruption, or other disturbance to federally protected
28 wetlands.

1 Regulations: Several regulations and General Plan policies would reduce impacts to
2 federally protected wetlands. These include, but are not limited to: GPA 960 Policy
3 LU 7.7 (no similar RCIP GP Policy), which states that buffers are required to the
4 extent possible between development and watercourses, including their associated
5 habitat; GPA 960 Policy OS 5.5 (RCIP GP Policy 5.5), which requires the
6 preservation and enhancement of existing native riparian habitat and prohibits the
7 obstruction of natural watercourses as well as fencing that constricts flow across
8 watercourses and their banks; GPA 960 Policy OS 6.2 (RCIP GP Policy 6.2), which
9 seeks to preserve buffer zones around wetlands where feasible and biologically
10 appropriate; and GPA 960 Policy OS 6.1 (RCIP GP Policy 6.1) which requires
11 compliance with Clean Water Act Section 404 in terms of wetlands mitigation
12 policies.

13 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.4.5 states, "If site conditions (for example,
14 topography, soils, vegetation, etc.) indicate that the proposed Project could affect
15 riparian/riverine areas or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of
16 the CWA, then an appropriate assessment shall be prepared by a qualified
17 professional as part of Riverside County's project review process. An assessment
18 shall include, but not be limited to, identification and mapping of any wetland(s) or
19 riparian resources present; evaluation of plant species composition, topography and
20 hydrology; a soils analysis (where appropriate) and conclusions stating the presence
21 or absence of jurisdictional wetlands. An assessment shall be completed as part of
22 the development review process. Should any grading or construction be proposed
23 within or alongside the banks of the watercourse or wetland, the land divider/permit
24 holder shall provide written notification to the Riverside County Planning
25 Department that the alteration of any watercourse or wetland, located either on site
26 or on any required offsite improvement areas, complies with the U.S. Army Corp of
27 Engineers Nationwide Permit Conditions. Or, the land divider shall obtain a permit
28

1 under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Copies of any agreements shall be
2 submitted along with the notification.”

3 Mitigation Measure MM 3.4.6 states, “If site conditions (e.g., topography, soils,
4 vegetation) indicate that the proposed Project could affect riparian/riverine areas or
5 federally protected wetlands as defined by Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et seq.,
6 then an appropriate assessment shall be prepared by a qualified professional as part
7 of Riverside County’s project review process. An assessment shall include, but not
8 be limited to, identification and mapping of any wetland(s) or riparian resources
9 present; evaluation of plant species composition, topography, and hydrology; a soils
10 analysis (where appropriate); and conclusions stating the presence or absence of
11 jurisdictional wetlands. An assessment shall be completed as part of the development
12 review process.

13 Should any grading or construction be proposed within or along the banks of any
14 natural watercourse or wetland located either on-site or on any required off-site
15 improvement areas, the land divider/permit holder shall provide written notification
16 to the Riverside County Planning Department that the appropriate CDFW
17 notification pursuant to Sections 1601/1603 of the Fish and Game Code has taken
18 place. Or, the land divider shall obtain an “Agreement Regarding Proposed Stream
19 or Lake Alteration” (Section 1601/1603 Permit). Copies of any agreements shall be
20 submitted along with the notification.”

21 Determination: Compliance with the applicable MSHCP, USACE guidelines, and General
22 Plan policies, and mitigation measures MM 3.4.5 and MM 3.4.6 would ensure no net
23 loss of riparian habitat and preservation of biological function and value of any
24 jurisdictional waters on-site, as well as buffer zones. Therefore, impacts would be
25 reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

26 7. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.4.4) Interfere Substantially with the
27 Movement of any Native Resident or Migratory Fish or Wildlife Species or with
28

Established Native Resident or Migratory Wildlife Corridors, or Impede the use of
Native Wildlife Nursery Sites

Residential development has the potential to result in the creation of new barriers to animal movement in the urbanizing areas, thus adversely affecting movement, migration, wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

Regulations: Sufficient programs, including corridor conservation measures, edge effect controls, and other components of the WRC-MSHCP and CV-MSHCP would ensure that future development in western Riverside County and the Coachella Valley does not substantially interfere with wildlife movement or corridors. In addition, the MSHCPs protect native wildlife nursery sites by conserving large blocks of representative native habitats suitable for supporting species' life-cycle requirements and the essential ecological processes of species that depend on such habitats.

Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.4.7 states, "Should a wildlife nursery site or native resident or migratory wildlife corridor be uncovered through a biological resources assessment (BRA), then a consultation with a Riverside County Ecological Resources Specialist (ERS) shall occur. The ERS shall make a determination if the site is essential for the long-term viability of the species. If such a determination is made, then the ERS shall work with the Project applicant to avoid the effects of development on the resource in question and condition the land use case accordingly. Should significant impacts to a nursery site or corridor not be avoidable, the applicant shall be required to ensure the preservation of comparable nursery or corridor habitat off-site."

Determination: The protections afforded by the WRC-MSHCP and CV-MSHCP would ensure that future development accommodated by the Project would have a less than significant impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or the use of native wildlife nursery sites in western Riverside County and the Coachella Valley. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.4.7 would ensure

1 that no significant interference with wildlife movement, corridors, or nursery sites
2 would occur outside of the MSHCP areas. For these reasons, impacts would be less
3 than cumulatively considerable.

4 D. Cultural Resources

5 8. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.5.1) *Substantial Adverse Change in the*
6 *Significance of a Historical Resource*

7 Future development accommodated by the Project would increase the amount of
8 urban development and ground disturbance in the County, which could in turn cause
9 a substantial adverse cumulative change in the significance of the County's historical
10 resources, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.
11 Additionally, in previously undisturbed areas and in areas not yet formally evaluated
12 for cultural resources, ground-disturbing activities could lead to the discovery of
13 historical resources deemed significant.

14 Regulations: The applicable regulatory measures would be determined during the County's
15 development review process, and included in a project's conditions of approval.
16 Standard conditions addressing project-specific cultural resource impacts include
17 requirements for site and tribal monitoring during construction; actions to take if a
18 cultural resource is inadvertently discovered during grading/construction (e.g.,
19 halting ground disturbance until appropriate preservation or mitigation measures are
20 determined in consultation with the Native American tribal representative, the
21 archaeologist, and the Planning Director); documentation and reporting requirements
22 to verify compliance; and specific protocols to be followed for the discovery of any
23 human remains, whether modern, historic, or prehistoric (e.g., remains left in place
24 and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and their
25 disposition has been made in consultation with the Riverside County Coroner and/or
26 the Native American Heritage Commission consistent with California Health and
27 Safety Code Section 7050.5). Vacant parcels in areas known to have prehistoric or
28 historic resources, as well as any parcels with environmental, geomorphological, or

vegetative features known to increase the likelihood of cultural resources being present, trigger a Phase I cultural resources study.

Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.5.1 states, "Avoidance is the preferred treatment for cultural resources. Where feasible, project plans shall be developed to allow avoidance of cultural resources. Where avoidance of construction impacts is possible, capping of the cultural resource site and avoidance planting (e.g., planting of prickly pear cactus) shall be employed to ensure that indirect impacts from increased public availability to the site are avoided. Where avoidance is selected, cultural resource sites shall be placed within permanent conservation easements or dedicated open space."

Determination: The regulations, procedures, and mitigation discussed above form a regulatory framework to ensure that the County's historical resources are protected on a comprehensive, or cumulative, level by requiring site-specific development to be adequately reviewed for cultural resources prior to approval; requiring appropriate mitigation measures to be developed and incorporated into project design and project conditions of approval; requiring that human remains are treated in accordance with applicable laws; and requiring that tribal participation occurs. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

9. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.5.2) Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of an Archaeological Resource

Future development accommodated by the Project would increase the amount of urban development and ground disturbance in the County, which could in turn cause a substantial adverse cumulative change in the significance of the County's archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Additionally, in previously undisturbed areas and in areas not yet formally evaluated for cultural resources, ground-disturbing activities could lead to the discovery of archaeological resources deemed significant.

1 Regulations: GPA 960 Policies OS-19.3 through OS-19.5 (RCIP GP Policies OS-19.3
2 through OS-19.5) require proposed development to be reviewed for the possibility
3 of cultural resources and for compliance with the County's cultural resources
4 program; to prioritize the protection of cultural resources preserved in place or left
5 in an undisturbed state by designating open space and allocating resources and/or tax
6 credits to the extent feasible; and to exercise sensitivity and respect for human
7 remains through compliance with all applicable laws concerning such remains. The
8 County's Planning Department has specific procedures and standard conditions of
9 approval to ensure that development projects are adequately reviewed, additional
10 information is collected where warranted, archaeological resources are identified
11 and, where significant, preserved, that any human remains uncovered are treated in
12 accordance with applicable laws and, lastly, that tribal participation occurs when
13 applicable. Vacant parcels in areas known to have prehistoric or historic resources,
14 as well as any parcels with environmental, geomorphological, or vegetative features
15 known to increase the likelihood of cultural resources being present, trigger a Phase
16 I cultural resources study and departmental procedures including review by the
17 Riverside County Archaeologist for prospective archaeological resource impacts, as
18 well as the application of additional conditions of approval as the individual project-
19 specific circumstances, Phase I cultural resources study, and any Phase II
20 archaeological testing studies dictate.

21 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.5.2 states, "If avoidance and/or preservation in place
22 of cultural resources is not feasible, the following mitigation measures shall be
23 initiated for each impacted site:

- 24 a. Discoveries shall be discussed with the Native American tribal (or other
25 appropriate ethnic/cultural group representative) and the Riverside County
26 Archaeologist, and a decision shall be made with the concurrence of the
27 Planning Director, as to the mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance,
28 etc.) appropriate for the cultural resource.

1 b. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery
2 until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to appropriate
3 preservation or mitigation measures.”

4 Determination: The regulations and procedures discussed above ensure that the County’s
5 archaeological resources are protected on a comprehensive, or cumulative, level by
6 requiring site-specific review and mitigation for archaeological resources and tribal
7 consultation. Mitigation measure MM 3.5.2 would further lessen impacts by
8 providing for dialogue with the appropriate ethnic or cultural group concerning the
9 dispensation of cultural resources where it is infeasible for those resources to be
10 avoided or preserved in place. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less than
11 cumulatively considerable level.

12 10. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.5.3) *Disturb Human Remains*

13 The proposed Project does not include components that would affect existing
14 cemeteries. However, future development accommodated by the Project would result
15 in disturbance of vacant lands, resulting in the potential to disturb buried human
16 remains interred outside of formal cemeteries, in both known and previously
17 unknown locations.

18 Regulations: The County’s Planning Department has specific procedures and standard
19 conditions of approval, including specific protocols to be followed for the discovery
20 of any human remains, whether modern, historic, or prehistoric (e.g., remains left in
21 place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and their
22 disposition has been made in consultation with the Riverside County Coroner and/or
23 the Native American Heritage Commission consistent with California Health and
24 Safety Code Section 7050.5). GPA 960 Policies OS-19.3 through OS-19.5 (RCIP GP
25 Policies OS-19.3 through OS-19.5) require proposed development to exercise
26 sensitivity and respect for human remains through compliance with all applicable
27 laws concerning such remains. California’s Traditional Tribal Places Act (SB 18)
28 requires Riverside County to consult with Native American groups at the earliest