

# COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

**Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number:** 41500  
**Project Case Type (s) and Number(s):** SP00343A1, GPA00873  
**Lead Agency Name:** County of Riverside Planning Department  
**Address:** P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92505-1409  
**Contact Person:** James Fagelson, Principal Planner  
**Telephone Number:** (951) 955-9514  
**Applicant's Name:** Desert Gold Ventures, LLC  
**Applicant's Address:** 5820 Canoga Avenue, Suite 240, Woodland Hills, CA 91367

### I. PROJECT INFORMATION

#### A. Project Description:

##### Project History

The property in question has a long and complex history, dating back to 1981 and involving four versions of a Specific Plan. In 1981, the County approved Specific Plan 151, the Oasis, along with a mitigated negative declaration addressing the CEQA requirements that supported the approval of the Specific Plan. That project was a mixed-use residential (including mobile homes) and commercial development that included a golf course.

In 1988, that plan was amended (Amendment No. 1) to facilitate a similar mixed-use concept as the Oasis, but modified to include single-family detached residential units instead of mobile homes. The commercial area was also changed to convey a more business-park concept.

In 1989, a land trade was completed that realigned the property boundary between the site and the Coachella Valley Preserve to the north. That transaction served, in part, to meet the project's biological resources mitigation and fee requirements.

Approval of Amendment No. 2 to the SP 151 in 1998, referred to "North Star Commerce Center and Golf Club," also facilitated a mixed-use concept, but modified to be even more of a business-park, commercial and recreational development. Amendment No. 2 resulted in the elimination of all permanent dwelling units.

Concurrent with Amendment No. 2 was the approval of several related, discretionary actions. Most of those actions, in one way or another, brought Amendment No. 2 into conformity and consistency with relevant land use, legal, policy, and other pertinent documents. Related approvals included, but were not limited to, Comprehensive General Plan Amendment No. 443 and Change of Zone 6346 and Mitigated Negative Declaration for Environmental Assessment No. 37291.

In December 2003, the County approved a mass grading permit (BGR 03-1397) to allow for the grading of the entire site. That approval was based on the finding that the grading was consistent with Amendment No. 2 and on the environmental clearances associated with that action. It was also found that, although the golf course was changed somewhat because of the need to accommodate flood issues and golfer preferences, the changes were in substantial conformance with the North Star Specific Plan and therefore consistent with the plan.

Subsequent to the grading permit, the following plot plans were submitted to the County. Each plot plan was also accompanied by an Environmental Assessment. All assessments were processed and approved as mitigated negative declarations.

**Table 1  
Plot Plans**

<b>Plot Plan Number</b>	<b>Submittal Date</b>	<b>Use</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>
PP 19050	12/04/03	Grading Plan	01/20/04
PP 19242	03/01/04	Golf Course	02/01/05
PP 19740	09/07/04	Clubhouse for Golf Course	06/13/05
PP 20512	05/04/05	Restrooms for Golf Course	09/26/05
PP 20570	06/09/05	Maintenance Building for Golf Course	02/07/07
PP 20876	09/08/05	Temporary Clubhouse	10/10/05
PP 21071	11/07/05	Temporary Clubhouse	11/10/05

All of the uses in Table 1 are either built or in the process of being built as of July 10, 2007.

On July 7, 2004, an application for a new Specific Plan (SP 343) was submitted to the County. Accompanying SP 343 was a request for a General Plan Amendment (GPA 470), a change of zone (CZ 7002), and a supporting Environmental Impact Report (EIR 470). The ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 was certified and the entitlements were approved on April 4, 2006.

Project Description:

The current request is for an amendment to the existing SP 343 to accommodate the following changes:

TABLE 1  
SUMMARY OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED SPECIFIC PLAN

Planning Area	Existing Acreage	Proposed Acreage	Existing SP Max. Floor Area	Proposed Max. Floor Area	Existing SP Maximum Dwelling Units	Proposed Max. Dwelling Units	Density (DU's/Acre) After Change
1	236.58	236.58	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	5.75	5.75	81,000	81,000	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	17.25	17.25	350 rooms, 25,000 s.f. spa, 32,000 s.f. meeting rooms 100' height limit	300 Rooms plus 125 residences/condos, 40,000 s.f. spa, 40,000 s.f. meeting rooms 150' height limit	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	7.31	12.30	N/A	N/A	54	130	10.57
5	8.6	8.6	N/A	height limit 100'	216	216	25.12
6a	12.25	12.25	height limit 75'	height limit 100'	216	240	19.59
6b	22.99	32.98	height limit 75'	height limit 100'	324	550	16.68
7	32.19	62.19	400,000 sf retail space 75,000 sf retail office space	975,000 sf retail space 150,000 sf retail office space height limit 75'	150	1,195 (700 residence lofts & 495 workforce housing flats) + 150 room hotel OR Apartment	N/A
8	66.63	21.65	1,200,000 sf	700,000 sf	N/A	N/A	N/A
9	11.37	11.37	230,000 sf	230,000 sf	N/A	N/A	N/A
10	16.54	16.54	100,000	100,000	N/A	N/A	N/A
Major Internal Sts.	9.59	9.59	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>447.05</b>	<b>447.05</b>	<b>2,068,000 and 350 unit hotel</b>	<b>2,316,000 and 425 unit hotel</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>2,481</b>	

Associated with the new SP is a proposal to change the General Plan designations to reflect the new development plan and land uses (an expansion of the commercial retail area, an expansion of the very high density residential area, and a contraction of the business park area).

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

**C. Total Project Area:** 447.05

<b>Residential Acres:</b> 66.13	<b>Lots:</b> Unknown	<b>Units:</b> 2,481	<b>Projected No. of Residents:</b> 6,699
<b>Commercial Acres:</b> 90.10	<b>Lots:</b> Unknown	<b>Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:</b> 1,280,000	<b>Est. No. of Employees:</b> 2,100
<b>Industrial Acres:</b> 21.65	<b>Lots:</b> Unknown	<b>Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:</b> 700,000	<b>Est. No. of Employees:</b> 2,900
<b>Other:</b> Golf Course, Clubhouse and Maintenance Facility – 242.33 acres	<b>Lots:</b> 2	<b>Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:</b> 81,000	<b>Est. No. of Employees:</b> 110
<b>Other:</b> Golf View Hotel – 17.25 acres	<b>Lots:</b> 1	<b>Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area and No. of Rooms:</b> 25,000 sq. ft. spa, 32,000 sq. ft. meeting rooms, 425 rooms	<b>Est. No. of Employees:</b> 700
<b>Other:</b> Major Internal Roads – 9.59 acres	<b>Lots:</b> 2	<b>Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:</b> 0	<b>Est. No. of Employees:</b> 0

**D. Assessor’s Parcel No(s):** 653-880-001, -002, -003, -004, -005, -006, -007, -008, -009, -010, -011, -012, -013, -014, -015

**E. Street References:** North of I-10/Varner Road, east of Cook Street, south of Western Avenue, and west of Avenue 38.

**F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:**  
Section 25 & 37, Township 4S, Range 6E

**G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings:** The entire Delfino Resort area plus the already constructed Classic Club Golf Course and associated clubhouse and maintenance building have been extensively graded and altered to accommodate development. No native plants remain on the property. Any native wildlife would only be those that stray onto the site from other properties.

The Coachella Valley Preserve borders the golf course on the north and east. The Preserve will remain in a natural state. The golf course has incorporated buffers and access agreements in order to maintain a workable boundary between the two uses. No other planning areas, other than the golf course (PA 1), border the Preserve.

Property to the west includes scattered development, but mostly vacant property. To the south is Varner Road, the I-10 freeway, the railroad line, and, across freeway and railroad, the City of Palm Desert. East of the property is the Coachella Valley Preserve, vacant land currently being processed as Specific Plan 360 (Valante) and vacant land that was approved for development under Specific Plan 338 (Mirasera). Property within the City is currently developing at urban levels.

Figure 1

Regional Location Map

Figure 2  
Vicinity Map

Figure 3  
Proposed Land Use Plan

**II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE POLICIES AND ZONING**

**A. General Plan Designation(s):** OS-R (Open Space Recreation), CT (Commercial Tourist), CO (Commercial Office), CR (Commercial Retail), MUPA (Mixed Use Policy Area), MHDR (Medium High Density Residential), VHDR (Very High Density Residential), BP (Business Park)

**B. Land Use Planning Area Information**

1. **Subarea, if any:** N/A

2. **Policy Area, if any:** N/A

**C. Area Plan Land Use Allocation Map Information**

1. **Area Plan, if any:** Western Coachella Valley

2. **Area Plan Land Use Designation, if any:** N/A

**D. Adopted Specific Plan Information**

1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** SP 343

2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** N/A

**E. Existing Zoning:** SP 343

**F. Proposed Zoning, if any:** SP 343

**G. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning:** W-2 to the southeast, N-A to the east and north, R-T and I-P to the northeast, and CPS to the west. Property to the south is within the City of Palm Desert.

**III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

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

#### IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<b>A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> I find that the proposed project <b>COULD NOT</b> have a significant effect on the environment, and a <b>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/> I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. <b>A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/> I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an <b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT</b> is required.

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

_____	October 25, 2007
Signature	Date
James Fagelson, Principal Planner	For Ron Goldman, Planning Director
Printed Name	

**V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT**

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

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

Source: RCIP Figure C-7 "Scenic Highways," Certified Environmental Impact Report 470

Findings of Fact: The property associated with the Delfino Resorts Specific Plan is adjacent to Interstate 10, a County eligible scenic highway. Due to the increase of height and change in massing of the planned buildings, the EIR will evaluate the new plan and provide mitigation measures to decrease the impact of the proposed plan on the visual environment.

Mitigation: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

<b>2. Mt. Palomar Observatory</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through <a href="#">Riverside County Ordinance No. 655</a> .	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 655

Findings of Fact: The entire project site is located within Zone B of Ordinance No. 655. The newly proposed configuration of the site will have an impact on nighttime views. This impact will be evaluated in the supplemental EIR and mitigation will be proposed.

Mitigation: To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

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

Source: Site Visit, Project Description

Findings of Fact: The new sources of light from the property were evaluated in the previously completed and certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470.

Mitigation: Compliance with the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 mitigation measures.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

<b>AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</b> Would the project				
<b>4. Agriculture</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract (Riv. Co. Agricultural Land Conservation Contract Maps)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to the location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source RCIP Figure OS-17 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database and Project Materials.

Findings of Fact: Although the subject property was once used for agriculture, there has been no farming on the site for many years. Plus, the property has been completely re-graded to accommodate the golf course and Delfino Resort. No agricultural use remains on the site.

There are no agricultural uses adjacent or near the Delfino Resort property. Property to the north and east is the Coachella Valley Preserve, a natural area that will remain as such indefinitely. Properties to the southeast, south, northwest, and west are all either developed or designated for urban level growth. There are no agricultural uses within 300 feet of the Delfino site, nor are there Williamson Act preserves nearby. Immediately to the east of the Delfino site, at its intersection with 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue, is a Jojoba farm. The property is currently designated as High Density Residential in the General Plan. Residential development is being considered for this property by the current owner.

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

The Delfino Resort property has already been approved for the types of uses envisioned in this amendment with only the acreages, number of dwelling units, and square footage of commercial, office, and industrial uses changing. No development consistent with the existing Specific Plan and this proposed amendment will result in the conversion of Farmland into non-agricultural uses.

Mitigation: None.

Monitoring: None.

**AIR QUALITY** Would the project

**5. Air Quality Impacts**

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

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 6-2

Findings of Fact: The air quality impact will be affected by the proposed plan and will be reevaluated based on a new traffic study to be completed as part of the supplemental EIR. A school (the Xavier Preparatory School) exists within one mile of the site and will be evaluated as a sensitive receptor. Mitigation will be proposed in an attempt to reduce the impacts of the project on the air quality in the region.

Mitigation: To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** Would the project

**6. Wildlife & Vegetation**

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
plan?				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: GIS Database, Site Visit

Findings of Fact: The entire site was previously evaluated for biological impacts and any impacts were already mitigated. The site has been completely graded and no effects on biological resources are anticipated. The Coachella Valley Preserve exists to the north of the site and adjacency issues have been mitigated for in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470. The proposed amendment to the SP will not create new biological impacts that have not already been analyzed and mitigated.

Mitigation: All mitigation measures in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b> Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>7. Historic Resources</b>				
a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?

Source: Site visit, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The site was evaluated in 1979 and in 1998 for archaeological and historic resources. Neither assessment revealed any historical resources.

Mitigation: None.

Monitoring: N/A

**8. Archaeological Resources**

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

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The previous site studies revealed no evidence of significant archaeological resources on the project site. In addition, the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians and other local tribes were notified of the intent to prepare an EIR during the most recent entitlement process. The Agua Caliente Tribe requested copies of the cultural resources documentation for the site and the presence of a cultural resources monitor during survey and/or ground disturbing activities in case buried cultural resources are uncovered. Since the entire site has been mass graded, it is unlikely that any archaeological resources will be uncovered during the precise grading phase. However, an approved cultural resources monitor will still be required for any earth moving activities that will occur in the future. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: Compliance with the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 mitigation measures.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

**9. Paleontological Resources**

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

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

Source: RCIP Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity"

Findings of Fact: The previous site studies revealed no evidence of significant paleontological resources on the project site. In addition, Figure OS-8 from the Riverside County Integrated Plan shows that the site lies within an area of low paleontological sensitivity. Since the entire site has been mass graded, it is unlikely that any paleontological resources will be uncovered during the precise grading phase.

Mitigation: None.

Monitoring: None

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS** Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Geologist Comments

Findings of Fact: In the previously approved ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470, it was shown that the project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo special study zone and that there are no faults mapped through or adjacent to the project area. It was also stated that strong ground shaking is the seismic hazard that is most likely to affect the site during the life of the intended structures. All previously required construction techniques to reduce the effect of ground shaking on the project will still be required for buildings onsite. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

<b>11. Liquefaction Potential Zone</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction"

Findings of Fact: Figure 14 of the Western Coachella Valley Area Plan shows that the subject site is moderately susceptible to liquefaction. Conditions for liquefaction include a relatively high water table

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

(within 40 feet of the surface), low relative densities of the saturated soils and susceptibility of the soil to liquefy based on grain size. In the previously approved ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470, it was shown that no free groundwater was encountered during the exploratory borings completed by the project geologist. The potential for liquefaction is small. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

**12. Ground-shaking Zone**

Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source: RCIP Figure S-18 "Inventory of Hazardous Materials"

Findings of Fact: As explained in the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470, strong ground motion is the seismic hazard that is most likely to affect the site during the life of the intended structures. Because of the alluvial sedimentary nature of the soils onsite, ground shaking characteristics are expected to include low-frequency vibration with relatively high amplitudes. There are several mitigation measures that were included in ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 that are still applicable. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

**13. Landslide Risk**

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

Source: On-site Inspection, RCIP Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope"

Findings of Fact: As stated in the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470, there is no evidence of past landsliding at the site and no known landslides are mapped in or around the project site. The Riverside County General Plan indicates that the property has a slope of less than 15%. A detailed contour map of the property shows that the site slopes northwesterly to southeasterly at a grade of less than 0.5%. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not

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

been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: None.

Monitoring: None

**14. Ground Subsidence**

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

Source: Resolution No. 94-125, RCIP

Findings of Fact: As stated in the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470, subsidence is prevalent throughout the Coachella Valley, including the project site. In light of the potential for settlement, especially during seismic events, the geologic study recommended specific mitigation measures for cut, fill and compaction to minimize subsidence and damage to buildings. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

**15. Other Geologic Hazards**

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

Source: Site visit, Project Application

Findings of Fact: The site is not subject to seiches or volcanic hazards. There is a potential for mudflows, although slight. Mitigation measures proposed in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 address this hazard and ensure that buildings onsite will be designed to avoid this potential hazard. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>16. Slopes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riv. Co. 800 Scale Slope Maps

Findings of Fact: The mass grading for the site was completed some time ago. The effects of the grading were previously evaluated and mitigated for in the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470. Since this Initial Study is evaluating the effects of adding square footage and dwelling units, and not increasing the amount of area that will be graded, the impacts to the slopes are less than significant. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

<b>17. Soils</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, Staff Review, application materials, site visit

Findings of Fact: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 evaluated the site in regards to soils and found that several mitigation measures could be included to reduce the impact of the project on soil erosion and the impact of expansive soil on the planned structures. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be developed per the NPDES requirements and will be approved by the Regional Water Quality Board. The geotechnical report included several mitigation measures to account for the existence of expansive soils onsite. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

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

<b>18. Erosion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact: These impacts were evaluated in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470. Mitigation measures were included that reduced the potential for impacts due to the project. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

<b>19. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. 460, Sec. 14.2 & Ord. 484

Findings of Fact: These impacts were evaluated in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470. Mitigation measures were included that reduced the potential for impacts due to the project. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** Would the project

<b>20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project materials

Findings of Fact: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 evaluated these topics and found that the uses likely to use potentially hazardous materials were the golf course and the industrial park. The golf course is required to develop a materials storage and management plan to ensure that any hazardous materials are handled and stored properly. In addition, any hazardous materials handling will be subject to all state and federal regulations required safe storage, handling, and disposal. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

<b>21. Airports</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?				
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP Figure S-19 "Airport Locations"

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

**Findings of Fact:** The closest airport is the privately operated Bermuda Dunes Airport. However, as shown in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470, the site is not within the land use compatibility area for the airport and is not subject to review by the Airport Land Use Commission. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

**Mitigation:** None.

**Monitoring:** None

**22. Hazardous Fire Area**

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

**Source:** RCIP Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility," Riverside GIS

**Findings of Fact:** According to the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 and Figure S-11 of the RCIP, the site is in an area with a low risk for wildland fire. Several mitigation measures were included in the EIR to prevent risk of loss involving fires in general. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

**Mitigation:** The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

**Monitoring:** The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** Would the project

**23. Water Quality Impacts**

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

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

c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

d) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors and odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report.

Findings of Fact: The Hydrology and Water Quality impacts were evaluated in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 and it was found that flood control issues are present onsite. However, through several mitigation measures those impacts can be reduced to a level less than significant.

The changes to the Specific Plan will require the need for an evaluation of the water demands at the site. A revised water supply assessment will be included and evaluated in the supplemental EIR, along with additional mitigation measures to reduce the impacts on the local water supply.

Mitigation: The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

## 24. Floodplains

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

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

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

water body?

Source: RCIP Figure S-9 “100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones,” Figure S-10 “Dam Failure Inundation Zone,” Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report

Findings of Fact: As discussed in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470, the site lies within a 100-year flood zone. A detailed hydraulics and hydrology study was completed for the site. The golf course has been designed to protect the commercial, industrial, and residential uses onsite. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: The mitigation measures included in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

**LAND USE/PLANNING** Would the project

<b>25. Land Use</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP, GIS, Project Materials

Findings of Fact: The previously approved Specific Plan 343 included the following uses:

Planning Area	Acreage	Max. Floor Area	Max. Dwelling Units	Density
1	236.58	N/A	N/A	
2	5.75	81,000	N/A	
3	17.25	Hotel: 350 rooms, 25,000 sqft. spa, 32,000 sqft. meeting rooms.	N/A	
4	7.31	N/A	54	7.4 du/ac
5	8.6	N/A	216	25.1 du/ac
6a	12.25	N/A	216	17.6 du/ac
6b	22.99	N/A	324	14.1 du/ac
7	32.19	400,000 sqft. 75,000 sqft. office	150	
8	66.63	1,200,000 sqft.	N/A	
9	11.37	230,000 sqft.	N/A	

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

10	16.54	100,000 sqft.	N/A	
Major Internal Streets	9.59	N/A	N/A	

The proposed plan is as follows:

Planning Area	Acreage	Max. Floor Area	Max. Dwelling Units	Density
1	236.58	N/A	N/A	
2	5.75	81,000	N/A	
3	17.25	Hotel: 350 rooms plus 125 condos, 40,000 sqft. spa, 40,000 sqft. meeting rooms.	N/A	
4	12.30	N/A	130	10.6 du/ac
5	8.6	N/A	216	25.1 du/ac
6a	12.25	N/A	240	19.6 du/ac
6b	32.98	N/A	550	16.7 du/ac
7	62.19	950,000 sqft. 150,000 sqft. office	1,195 (700 residence lofts & 495 workforce housing flats) + 150 room hotel OR Apartment	
8	21.65	700,000 sqft.	N/A	
9	11.37	230,000 sqft.	N/A	
10	16.54	100,000 sqft.	N/A	
Major Internal Streets	9.59	N/A	N/A	

The new uses will be evaluated in the supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: Mitigation will be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

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

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

Source: RCIP Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS

Findings of Fact: The proposed plan is not consistent with the approved Specific Plan 343 due to the shifts in general plan designations for three of the planning areas (specifically the very high density residential, the commercial retail, and the business park planning areas). The planning impacts will be evaluated in the supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

**MINERAL RESOURCES** Would the project

**27. Mineral Resources**

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?

d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?

Source: RCIP Figure MS-5 "Mineral Resources Area"

Findings of Fact: As shown in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470, the site was classified as potentially having mineral resources onsite, though the location and confirmed existence was unknown. In addition, borings completed showed that the soils onsite were mainly windblown sands. It was determined that mineral resources are non-existent on the site. The proposed SP amendment will not create new impacts which have not been previously analyzed and mitigated under the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 for the SP.

Mitigation: None.

Monitoring: None

**NOISE** Would the project result in

**Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings**

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

NA - Not Applicable

A - Generally Acceptable

B - Conditionally Acceptable

C - Generally Unacceptable

D - Land Use Discouraged

**28. Airport Noise**

a) For a project located within an airport land use plan

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

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

NA  A  B  C  D

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

NA  A  B  C  D

Source: RCIP Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map

Findings of Fact: As discussed in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470, the site is not located within an airport land use plan. The Bermuda Dunes Airport, a privately owned airport, is the closest airstrip to the site. The site is outside the affected area of noise impacts for the airport.

Mitigation: None.

Monitoring: None

**29. Railroad Noise**

NA  A  B  C  D

Source: RCIP Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", S-21 "Rail Facilities, Available Water, Oil and Natural Gas Pipelines Inventory Data", Thomas Guide 2005 Edition, Site Visit

Findings of Fact: As shown in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470, any noise from the railroad will be exceeded by noise from the interstate highway.

Mitigation: None; any mitigation measure for the highway noise will be sufficient.

Monitoring: None

**30. Highway Noise**

NA  A  B  C  D

Source: Application materials, Site Visit, Project Exhibit

Findings of Fact: The highway noise expected onsite will be reevaluated based on the new traffic study in the supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the Supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

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

<b>31. Other Noise</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/>				

Source: Project description and materials

Findings of Fact: None.

Mitigation: Not applicable

Monitoring: Not applicable

<b>32. Noise Effects on or by the Project</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project materials and description

Findings of Fact: The noise impacts will be evaluated based on the new traffic study completed for the Supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the Supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING</b> Would the project				
<b>33. Housing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

population projections?				
f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project description and materials, GIS

Findings of Fact: The project will not displace any existing housing or require any replacement housing since there are none that exist onsite. The site is not in a County Redevelopment Project Area. The increased impact of the proposed amendment to the SP on population growth and affordable housing will be evaluated in the Supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the Supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

<b>PUBLIC SERVICES</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
<b>34. Fire Services</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP Safety Element

Findings of Fact: The proposed change to SP 343 would increase the dwelling units and commercial/office space planned for the development, effectively increasing the impact to the fire services to the site. The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 stated that the Riverside County Fire Department would serve the site. The evaluation of the impact on the Fire Department will be included in the Supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

<b>35. Sheriff Services</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The impact on the Sheriff's Department will be evaluated in the Supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

<b>36. Schools</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

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

Source: Palm Springs Unified School District

Findings of Fact: The impact on the Palm Springs Unified School District will be evaluated in the Supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

---

**37. Libraries**

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

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The impact on the libraries will be evaluated in the Supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

---

**38. Health Services**

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

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The impact on the local health services will be evaluated in the Supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

---

**RECREATION**

**39. Parks and Recreation**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Source: GIS, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35, Ord. No. 659, Parks & Open Space Department Review

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

**Findings of Fact:** The increased impact of the proposed amendment to the SP on recreational facilities in the region will be evaluated in the Supplemental EIR.

**Mitigation:** To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

**Monitoring:** To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

**40. Recreational Trails**

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

**Source:** Riv. Co. 800 Scale Equestrian Trail Maps, Open Space and Conservation Map for Western County trail alignments

**Findings of Fact:** A Class I bike trail runs along Varner Road and was previously considered.. See previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470.

**Mitigation:** All mitigation measures in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference..

**Monitoring:** The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** Would the project

**41. Circulation**

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

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

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

b) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways?

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

d) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

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

e) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?

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

f) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?

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

g) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?

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

h) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?

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

i) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?

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

j) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

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

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

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: A traffic study will be completed as part of the Supplemental EIR. This will evaluate the traffic generation of the revised land uses and estimate the impacts to the surrounding circulation elements. The project will not effect air traffic or its patterns, waterborne traffic, or rail traffic, increase hazards to a design feature, or result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses. The impacts to the area roadways will be evaluated in the Supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the Supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

---

**42. Bike Trails**

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: A Class I bike path is planned along Varner Road per the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470.

Mitigation: All mitigation measures in the previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 are incorporated by reference.

Monitoring: The previously certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470 monitoring requirements will be followed.

---

**UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** Would the project

**43. Water**

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

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

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact: The water supplies and demands of the project will be reevaluated based on the revised site plan with an updated Water Supply Assessment for inclusion in the Supplemental EIR. Potential water supplies available to the site include groundwater, Colorado River Water, and reclaimed water.

Mitigation: To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

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

<b>44. Sewer</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact: The sewer treatment requirements will be evaluated in the Supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

<b>45. Solid Waste</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan))?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP, Letter from Riverside County Waste Management

Findings of Fact: The impacts to solid waste facilities will be evaluated in the Supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

<b>46. Utilities</b>				
a) Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
a) Electricity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The impacts to utilities will be evaluated in the supplemental EIR.

Mitigation: To be determined in the supplemental EIR.

Monitoring: To be determined in a Supplemental EIR

**OTHER**

47. Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review

Findings of Fact: None.

Mitigation:

Monitoring:

**OTHER**

48. Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review

Findings of Fact: None.

Mitigation:

Monitoring:

**OTHER**

49. Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review

Findings of Fact: None.

Mitigation:

Monitoring:

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

**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

                

Source: Staff review, Application materials

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

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

                

Source: Staff review, Project application

Findings of Fact: The proposed project does not have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

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

                

Source: Staff review, project application

Findings of Fact: The project has impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable including air quality impacts and traffic impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>53.</b> Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Staff review, project application

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

**VI. EARLIER ANALYSES**

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

RCIP: Riverside County Integrated Project

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 470

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

Location: County of Riverside Planning Department  
4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor  
Riverside, CA 92505

Y:\Planning Master Forms\EA.doc