

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 42093
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Plot Plan No. 23890
Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department
Address: P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409
Contact Person: Damaris Abraham
Telephone Number: (951) 955-5719
Applicant's Name: Robert McCormick
Applicant's Address: 27 Via Granada, Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description: This plot plan proposes a wireless communication facility, for Verizon Wireless, disguised as a 70 foot high palm tree with eighteen (18) panel antennas located on three (3) sectors and one (1) parabolic antenna. The 1,600 square foot lease area surrounded by 6' high split face decorative block wall and landscaping will contain a 184 square foot equipment shelter and two (2) GPS antennas. Two 45 feet high live palm trees are also proposed to be planted in the project area.

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

C. Total Project Area: 1,600 square feet on a 0.41 acre parcel

| | | | |
|--|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Residential Acres: | Lots: 1 | Units: | Projected No. of Residents: |
| Commercial Acres: | Lots: | Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: | Est. No. of Employees: |
| Industrial Acres: | Lots: | Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: | Est. No. of Employees: |
| Other: 1,600 square foot lease area | | | |

D. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 763-250-032

E. Street References: Northerly of Airport Blvd, southerly of 55th Ave, easterly of Harrison St, and westerly of Tyler St.

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description: Township 6 South, Range 8 East, Section 17

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: This project site is being utilized as a single family residence and it is surrounded by vacant land to the north and east, storage yard to the west, and airport to the south.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

- 1. Land Use:** The project implements Policy LU 4.1, requiring new developments to be located and designed to visually enhance, not degrade, the character of the surrounding area. The proposed project is consistent with the Community Development: Light Industrial (CD:LI) (0.25 – 0.60 Floor Area Ratio) land use designation and other applicable land use policies within the General Plan.

2. **Circulation:** The project has adequate circulation to the site and is therefore consistent with the Circulation Element of the General Plan. The proposed project meets all other applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.
3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** No natural open space land was required to be preserved within the boundaries of this project. The proposed project meets with all other applicable Multipurpose Open Space element policies.
4. **Safety:** The proposed project is not located within any special hazard zone (including FEMA flood zone, fault zone, high fire hazard area, dam inundation zone, area with high liquefaction potential, etc.). The proposed project has allowed for sufficient provision of emergency response services to the future residents of this project through the project design and payment of development impact fees. The proposed project meets with all other applicable Safety element policies.
5. **Noise:** Sufficient mitigation against any foreseeable noise sources in the area have been provided for in the design of the project. The project will not generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan or noise ordinance. The project meets all other applicable Noise Element Policies.
6. **Housing:** The proposed project meets all applicable Housing Element Policies.
7. **Air Quality:** The proposed project has been conditioned to control any fugitive dust during grading and construction activities. The proposed project meets all other applicable Air Quality element policies.

B. General Plan Area Plan(s): Eastern Coachella Valley

C. Foundation Component(s): Community Development (CD)

D. Land Use Designation(s): Light Industrial (LI)

E. Overlay(s), if any: Not Applicable

F. Policy Area(s), if any: Not Applicable

III. Adjacent and Surrounding Area Plan(s), Foundation Component(s), Land Use Designation(s), and Overlay(s) and Policy Area(s), if any: The project site is surrounded by properties which are designated Community Development: Light Industrial (CD:LI) (0.25 – 0.60 Floor Area Ratio) to the north, east, and west Community Development: Public Facilities (CD:PF) (0.60 Floor Area Ratio) and Community Development: Light Industrial (CD:LI) (0.25 – 0.60 Floor Area Ratio) to the south.

A. Adopted Specific Plan Information

1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** Not Applicable

2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** Not Applicable

B. Existing Zoning: Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC)

C. Proposed Zoning, if any: Not Applicable

D. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC) to the north, east, and west and Industrial Park (I-P) and Manufacturing-Heavy (M-H) to the south.

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

V. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, **NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED** because (a) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible.
- I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An **ADDENDUM** to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.

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

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

Signature

Damaris Abraham, Project Planner

Printed Name

December 22, 2009

Date

For Ron Goldman, Planning Director

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

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

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-9 “Scenic Highways”

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located northerly of Airport Blvd, southerly of 55th Ave, easterly of Harrison St, and westerly of Tyler St. The General Plan indicates that the project is not located within a designated scenic highway corridor. Therefore, the project will have no impact.

b) The site is not anticipated to obstruct any prominent scenic vistas, views open to the public, or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. Additionally, the project has been designed to be disguised as a palm tree and an equipment shelter to minimize the visual impact of the telecommunication facility. Impacts are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: Prior to building permit issuance, the developer/permit holder shall provide a palm frond design that is consistent with the approved plot plan and that covers all antennas. (COA 80.PLANNING. 10) and the developer/permit holder shall ensure that the palm fronds are designed and placed in such a manner that covers all of the antennas (COA 90.PLANNING.16).

Monitoring: Mitigation monitoring will occur through the Building and Safety Plan Check process.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. Mt. Palomar Observatory | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655? | <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: GIS database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution)

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located 44.32 miles away from the Mt. Palomar Observatory; which is within the designated 45-mile (ZONE B) Special Lighting Area that surrounds the Mt. Palomar Observatory. Ordinance No. 655 requires methods of installation, definition, requirements for lamp source and shielding, prohibition and exceptions. With incorporation of project lighting requirements of the Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 into the proposed project, this impact will be reduced to a less than significant impact. All proposed outdoor lighting shall comply with Ordinance No. 655, which includes the use of low pressure sodium vapor lighting or overhead high pressure sodium vapor lighting with shields or luminaries. (COA 10.PLANNING.25) This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Description

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed communication facility may provide a service light to be used at the time of servicing the facility, however, it will not create new sources of light or glare in the area and will not expose residential property to unacceptable light levels. The project will have less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

| AGRICULTURE RESOURCES Would the project | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. Agriculture | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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"/> |

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

Source: GIS database, and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is not located within the boundaries of designated farmland – as designated by the most recent version of the Important Farmland Map (as prepared by the California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program). Therefore the proposed project will not impact land designated as Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use.

b) The project is not located within an Agriculture Preserve or under a Williamson Act contract; therefore, no impact will occur as a result of the proposed project.

c) The project site is not surrounded by agriculturally zoned land. Therefore, the project will not cause development of a non-agricultural use within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property. The project will have no impact.

d) The project will not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

| AIR QUALITY Would the project | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 5. Air Quality Impacts | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 6-2

Findings of Fact: Appendix G of the current State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project will significantly impact air quality if the project violates any ambient air quality standard, contributes substantially to an existing air quality violation, or exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

a) The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Governing Board adopted its most recent Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the SCAB on August 1, 2003. The AQMP is a plan for the regional improvement of air quality. As part of adoption of the County's General Plan in 2003, the General Plan EIR (SCH No. 2002051143) analyzed the General Plan growth projections for consistency with the AQMP and concluded that the General Plan is consistent with the SCAQMD's AQMP. The project is consistent with the County General Plan and would therefore be consistent with the SCAQMD's AQMP.

b-c) The South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) is in a non-attainment status for federal ozone standards, federal carbon monoxide standards, and state and federal particulate matter standards. Any development in the SCAB, including the proposed Project, would cumulatively contribute to these pollutant violations.

The project is consistent with the General Plan and the Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan land use designations. The General Plan (2003) is a policy document that reflects the County's vision for the future of Riverside County. The General Plan is organized into eight separate elements, including an Air Quality Element. The purpose of the Air Quality Element is to protect County residents from the harmful effects of poor air quality. The Air Quality Element identifies goals, policies, and programs that are meant to balance actions regarding land use, circulation, and other issues with their potential effects on air quality. The Air Quality Element, in conjunction with local and regional air quality planning efforts, addresses ambient air quality standards set forth by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Potential air quality impacts resulting from the proposed Project would not exceed emissions projected by the Air Quality Element. The County is charged with implementing the policies in the General Plan Air Quality Element, which are focused on reducing concentrations of criteria pollutants, reducing negative impacts to sensitive receptors, reducing mobile and stationary pollutant sources, increasing energy conservation and efficiency, improving the jobs to housing balance, and facilitating multi-jurisdictional coordination for the improvement of air quality.

Implementation of the project would not impact air quality beyond the levels documented in EIR No. 441 prepared for the General Plan. The project would impact air quality in the short-term during construction and in the long-term through operation. In accordance with standard county requirements, dust control measures and maintenance of construction equipment shall be utilized on the property to limit the amount of particulate matter generated. These are standard requirements and are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

The proposed project would primarily impact air quality through increased automotive emissions. Single projects typically do not generate enough traffic and associated air pollutants to violate clean air standards or contribute enough air pollutants to be considered a cumulatively considerable

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

significant impact. Operational impacts associated with the project would be expected to result in emissions of VOC, NOX, CO, PM10, PM2.5 and SOX. Operational emissions would result from vehicle emissions, fugitive dust associated with vehicle travel, combustion emissions associated with natural gas use, emission related to electricity generation, and landscape equipment maintenance emissions. In the long term, emissions of VOC, NOX, CO, PM10 and PM2.5 and could exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds (in pounds per day). In addition, another potential impact is emissions from the project that may contribute to green house gases (GHGs) and therefore to global climate change. An individual project cannot generate enough GHG emissions to individually influence global climate change. However, the project may have an incremental contribution to cumulative GHG emissions. To date, no Federal, State, or project area local agencies have developed thresholds against which a proposed project can be evaluated to assist lead agencies in determining whether or not the proposed project is significant. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines (section 15064 (h) (3)) a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative impact may be considered less than significant if the Project will comply with a mitigation program that addresses the impact. The project will primarily impact GHGs by emissions of carbon dioxide in the form of vehicle exhaust and use of electricity. However, with compliance with standard requirements for use of low VOC paints and compliance with California Energy Commission Title 24 requirements for building energy efficiency, direct and cumulative air quality impacts would be reduced to a level below significance. These are standard requirements and are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

d) A sensitive receptor is a person in the population who is particularly susceptible to health effects due to exposure to an air contaminant than is the population at large. Sensitive receptors (and the facilities that house them) in proximity to localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants or odors are of particular concern. High levels of CO are associated with major traffic sources, such as freeways and major intersections, and toxic air contaminants are normally associated with manufacturing and commercial operations. Land uses considered to be sensitive receptors include long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. Surrounding land uses include residential, which is considered a sensitive receptor, however, an unmanned telecommunications facility is not considered a substantial point source emitter or a sensitive receptor.

e) Surrounding land uses do not include significant localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants, or odors. An unmanned telecommunications facility is not considered a substantial point source emitter or a sensitive receptor.

f) The project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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 plan?

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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, CVMSHCP

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site does not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan. The project site is not located within a conservation area of the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (CVMSHCP). Therefore, there is no impact.

b) The project site is not located within a conservation area of the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (CVMSHCP). The project will not 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). Therefore, there is no impact.

c) The project site is not located within a conservation area of the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (CVMSHCP). The project will not 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. Therefore, there is no impact.

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

d) The project will not 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. Therefore, there is no impact.

e-f) The project site does not contain riverine/riparian areas or vernal pools. Therefore, there is no impact.

g) The proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 7. Historic Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The site is fully disturbed with a single family residence on site. And the project does not propose the disturbance of a historic site or the demolishing of historic structures. The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 8. Archaeological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

a) An archaeological report was not required for the project site. Site disturbance has already occurred from grading for the use of the single family residence existing on site. The project site does not contain an archaeological site. Therefore, the project will not alter or destroy an archaeological site.

b) The proposed project is not expected to impact archaeological resources. If, however, during ground disturbing activities, unique cultural resources are discovered, all ground disturbances shall halt until a meeting is held between the developer, archaeologist, and Native American representative to discuss the significance of the find. (COA 10.PLANNING.19) Therefore, the project will not alter or destroy an archaeological site or cause a substantive adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

c) There may be a possibility that ground disturbing activities will expose human remains. The project is subject to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 if human remains are discovered during ground disturbing activities. (COA 10.PLANNING.18) This is a standard condition and not considered mitigation for CEQA purposes. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

d) The project will not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required

9. Paleontological Resources

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity", County Paleontological Report (PDP) No. 1348

Findings of Fact:

a) County Paleontological Report (PDP) No. 1348 submitted for this project concluded that the occurrence of previously recorded fossil sites near the site indicate that there would be a high potential for previously unrecorded fossil sites and similar fossil remains being encountered by earth-moving activities at the site. And there would be a high potential for the disturbance and loss of paleontologic resources, including associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic fossil site data as a result of earth-moving activities. With incorporation of the recommended mitigation measures, the project will have less than significant impact on paleontological resources.

Mitigation: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) shall be submitted and approved by the County Geologist. (COA 10.PLANNING.20 and COA 60.PLANNING.8)

Monitoring: Mitigation monitoring will occur through the Building and Safety Plan Check process.

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

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones | <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: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, County Geologist review (GEO02144)

Findings of Fact:

a-b) According to GEO02144, the nearest active fault to the site is the San Andreas Fault located approximately 4.7 miles from the site and the potential for surface rupture at the site due to fault plane displacement propagating the ground surface during the design life of the proposed development project is considered low. In addition, California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction", GIS Database, County Geologist review (GEO02144)

Findings of Fact:

a) According to GEO02144, earthquake induced liquefaction potential is high at this site. GEO02144 recommended two (2) feet of over excavation and recompaction to improve the bearing value of the foundation for the shelter area and the actual depth of the caisson for the cell tower has to be designed by the project structural engineer to accommodate a 2.6-inch of seismic settlement. (COA 10.PLANNING.21) However, the said condition is not considered unique mitigation and is not required for CEQA implementation purposes. The project will have less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

12. Ground-shaking Zone
 Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), County Geologist review (GEO02144)

Findings of Fact:

There are no known active or potentially active faults that traverse the site and the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The principal seismic hazard that could affect the site is ground shaking resulting from an earthquake occurring along several major active or potentially active faults in southern California. California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

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: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope", County Geologist review (GEO02144)

Findings of Fact:

a) The topography of the site is relatively flat; therefore, landslides are not a potential hazard to the site. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 "Documented Subsidence Areas", Project Application Materials, County Geologist review (GEO02144)

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located in an area of active subsidence. Subsidence is a potential hazard to the site. However, the proposed development a monopole with a single caisson foundation and small equipment pad. Subsidence in the area due to groundwater extraction is a regional effect. Subsidence will not cause any differential settlement or cracking of the foundation and will therefore have a minimal impact on the proposed development. The project will have less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

15. Other Geologic Hazards

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

Source: Project Application Materials, County Geologist review (GEO02144)

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located near any large bodies of water or in a known volcanic area; therefore, the project site is not subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

16. Slopes

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?

c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?

Source: Project Application Materials, Building and Safety – Grading Review

Findings of Fact:

a-c) Standard conditions of approval have been added stating that a grading permit is required prior to construction grading. These conditions are not considered unique mitigation and are not required for CEQA implementation purposes. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

17. Soils

a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

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?

Source: General Plan figure S-6 "Engineering Geologic Materials Map", Flood Control review, Building and Safety Grading review, application materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The development of the site could result in the loss of topsoil from grading activities, but not in a manner that would result in significant amounts of soil erosion. Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) would reduce the impact to below a level of significance. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) The project may be located on expansive soil; however, California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to commercial development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

18. Erosion

a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?

b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?

Source: Flood Control District review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Implementation of the proposed project will involve grading and various construction activities. Standard construction procedures, and federal, state and local regulations implemented in conjunction with the site's storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and its Best Management Practices (BMPs) required under the National Pollution Discharge System (NPDES) general construction permit, will minimize potential for erosion during construction. These practices will keep substantial amounts of soil material from eroding from the project site and prevent deposition within receiving waters located downstream.

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

b) The potential for on-site erosion will increase due to grading and excavating activities during the construction phase. However, BMPs will be implemented for maintaining water quality and reducing erosion.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 19. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. 460, Sec. 14.2 & Ord. 484

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site lies within a moderate area of wind erosion. The project could be influenced by wind erosion and blowsand issues during project grading. Blowsand can create drifting sand dunes and can act as an abrasive on metal, glass and wood surfaces such as cars, windows, and siding of existing homes. A PM10 Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan, prepared in accordance with the AQMD Rule 403.1 shall be submitted to the Building and Safety Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of a grading permit (COA 60.BS GRADE.1). With the incorporation of this mitigation measure, the project will have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: Prior to grading permit issuance, a PM10 Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan, prepared in accordance with AQMD Rule 403.1, shall be submitted to the Building and Safety Department for review and approval (COA 60.BS GRADE.1).

Monitoring: Mitigation monitoring will occur through the Building and Safety Plan check process.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of | <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

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

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?

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-e) The project does not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. It will also not impair the implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. The project will have no impact on emitting, or handling hazardous waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The project is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

21. Airports

a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?

b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?

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?

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?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," GIS database, Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) development review, report dated June 1, 2009

a-b) The project site is located in Airport Zone "D" of the 2005 Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The project was reviewed by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission and was found to be consistent with the 2005 Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, subject to the conditions outlined in the ALUC report. (COA 10.PLANNING.23 and COA 10.PLANNING.26) However, the said condition is not considered unique mitigation and is not required for CEQA implementation purposes. The project will have less than significant impact.

c-d) The project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; therefore the project will have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility," GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located in a high fire area. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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 the capacity of existing or planned storm water 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?

f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

h) Include new or retrofitted storm water 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)?

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 “100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones,” Coachella Valley Water District letter dated December 22, 2008

Findings of Fact:

a) The project area is protected from regional stormwater flows by the Coachella Valley Stormwater Channel and may be considered safe from regional stormwater flows except in rare instances. In addition, the project has been designed to perpetuate the site’s natural drainage pattern. Therefore, the project shall not 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. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) Due to the small size and limited development of the project site, the project is not anticipated to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

c) The project will not 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. Therefore, the impact is no impact.

d) Due to the amount of impervious surfaces within the project site, this proposal will not increase flow rates on downstream property owners. Therefore, no new flood control facilities or water quality mitigation will be required. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant

e) The project site is not located within a 100 year flood zone. Therefore, the project shall not 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.

f) The project site is not located within a 100 year flood zone. Therefore, the project shall not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.

g) The project is not anticipated to otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The project has been conditioned to provide to the Building and Safety Department evidence of compliance with the N.P.D.E.S. (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement and to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) prior to issuance of any grading or construction permit (COA 60. BS GRADE.5). This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

h) The project does not 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). Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

24. Floodplains

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

| NA - Not Applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | U - Generally Unsuitable <input type="checkbox"/> | R - Restricted <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 “100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones,” Figure S-10 “Dam Failure Inundation Zone,” Coachella Valley Water District letter dated December 22, 2008, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site is not located in a 100-year flood plain and shall not 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. Therefore, there is no impact.
- b) The project site is not located in a 100-year flood plain. Therefore, the project will not result in changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff within a floodplain. Therefore, there is no impact.
- c) The project site is not within a 100-year flood plain. Therefore, the project shall not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam within a floodplain. Therefore, there is no impact.
- d) The project site is not located in a 100-year flood plain. The project will not cause changes in the amount of surface water in any water body. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

| 25. Land Use | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed use is in compliance with the current land use of Community Development: Light Industrial (CD: LI) (0.25 – 0.60 Floor Area Ratio) in the Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan. The project will have a less than significant impact as it likely will not result in the substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area.

b) The project is located within Coachella City sphere of influence. However, the project proposes a 70-foot high wireless communication facility disguised as a palm tree in a 1,600 square foot lease area. Due to the small size and limited development of the project site, the proposal is not anticipated to affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project will be consistent with the site's existing zoning of Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC). The project is surrounded by Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC) to the north, east, and west, and Industrial-Park (I-P) and Manufacturing-Heavy (M-H) to the south. The project will have no impact.

c) The proposed cell tower will be designed as a 70 foot high monopalm. As a result, the project will be compatible with existing surrounding zoning and with existing and planned surrounding land uses. Impacts are less than significant.

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

d-e) The project is consistent with the land use designations and policies of the General Plan. In addition, the project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 “Mineral Resources Area”

a-b) According to General Plan Figure OS-5, the proposed project is located in an area that is designated MRZ-3. MRZ-3 is an area where mineral deposits are likely to exist however the significance of the deposits is undetermined. The RCIP identifies policies that encourage protection for existing mining operations and for appropriate management of mineral extraction. A significant impact that would constitute a loss of availability of a known mineral resource would include unmanaged extraction or encroach on existing extraction. No existing or abandoned quarries or mines exist in the area surrounding the project site. The project does not propose any mineral extraction on the project site. Any mineral resources on the project site will be unavailable for the life of the project; however, the project will not result in the permanent loss of significant mineral resources.

c-d) The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a surface mine, therefore it is not subject to creating an incompatible land use. The proposed project will have no impact with regard to incompatible land uses located adjacent to an existing surface mine. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of any quarries or mines which may pose a risk for people or property. The proposed project will have no impact with regard to exposure to quarries or mines. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

NOISE Would the project result in

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

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 28. Airport Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project site is located in Airport Zone "D" of the 2005 Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The project was reviewed by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission and was found to be consistent with the 2005 Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The project will have less than significant impact as it will not expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 29. Railroad Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", GIS database, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located adjacent to a rail line. No impacts will occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 30. Highway Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project is not directly adjacent to any Highway. There will be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

31. Other Noise

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A <input type="checkbox"/> | B <input type="checkbox"/> | C <input type="checkbox"/> | D <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database

Findings of Fact: No additional noise sources have been identified near the project site that would contribute a significant amount of noise to the project. There will be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

32. Noise Effects on or by the Project

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

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Although the project will increase the ambient noise level in the immediate vicinity during construction, and the general ambient noise level will increase slightly after project completion, the impacts are not considered significant.

b) All noise generated during project construction and the operation of the site must comply with the County's noise standards, which restricts construction (short-term) and operational (long-term) noise levels. The project will have a less than significant impact.

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

c-d) The project would not expose 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 or expose persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The project will have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 33. Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project is a 70 foot high monopalm with an equipment shelter in a 1,600 square foot lease area. The scope of the development is not substantial enough to displace a number of housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project will have no impact.
- b) The project will not create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income. The project will have no impact.
- c) The project will not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project will have no impact.
- d) The project is located within a Redevelopment Area. The project was reviewed by the Riverside County Economic Development Agency. The project will have less than significant impact as it will not affect a County Redevelopment Project Area.

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

e) The project will not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections. The project will have no impact.

f) The project could potentially encourage additional residential development in the area since there will be better wireless phone coverage, but the development would have to be consistent with the land uses designated by the General Plan. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

34. Fire Services

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact:

The project area is serviced by the Riverside County Fire Department. Any potential significant effects will be mitigated by the payment of standard fees to the County of Riverside. The project will not directly physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new facilities. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. The project shall comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to fire services. (COA 90.PLANNING.7) This is a standard Condition of Approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

35. Sheriff Services

Source: General Plan

The proposed area is serviced by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. The proposed project would not have an incremental effect on the level of sheriff services provided in the vicinity of the project area. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of this project and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. The project shall comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to sheriff services. (COA 90.PLANNING.7) This is a standard Condition of Approval and pursuant to CEQA, is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

36. Schools

Source: Coachella Valley Unified School District, GIS database

Findings of Fact: The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. The proposed project is located within the Palm Springs Unified School District. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of this project and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. This project has been conditioned to comply with School Mitigation Impact fees in order to mitigate the potential effects to school services. (COA 80.PLANNING.11) This is a standard Condition of Approval and pursuant to CEQA, is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

37. Libraries

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

The proposed project will not create a significant incremental demand for library services. The project will not require the provision of new or altered government facilities at this time. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. This project shall comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to library services. (COA 90.PLANNING.7) This is a standard Condition of Approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

38. Health Services

Source: General Plan

Findings of Fact:

The use of the proposed lease area would not cause an impact on health services. The site is located within the service parameters of County health centers. The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. The project will have no impact. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of this project and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

RECREATION

39. Parks and Recreation

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

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?

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

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications), Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees), Parks & Open Space Department Review

a) The project proposes a 70 foot high monopalm and an equipment shelter within a 1,600 square foot lease area. The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The project will have no impact.

b) The project would not include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreation facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. The project will have no impact.

c) The project is located within County Service Area No. 125. This is a commercial project and as such is not subject to Quimby fees. The project will have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

40. Recreational Trails

Source: RCIP Figure C-7 “Trails and Bikeway System”

Findings of Fact: According to the RCIP, no regional or community trails will be affected by the project area. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

| TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 41. Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

a) The project will generate minimal traffic to the area and regional transportation system. The project will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. The impact is less than significant.

b) The project will not result in inadequate parking capacity because parking spaces are not required to accommodate the project. The project will have no impact.

c) The project will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways. The project will have no impact.

e) The project does not propose any design issues that would cause a change in air traffic patterns, alter waterborne, or rail and air traffic. The project will have no impact.

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

f-g) The project will not substantially increase hazards to a design feature or cause an effect upon a need for new or altered maintenance of roads. The project will have no impact.

h) The project site will cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction; however, impacts are considered less than significant.

i) The project will not cause inadequate emergency access to nearby uses or conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation. The project will have no impact.

j) The project site will not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks). The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

42. Bike Trails

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: According to the RCIP, no bike trails are adjacent to or located within the project site. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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:

a-b) The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

44. Sewer

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

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

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

a-b) he proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

45. Solid Waste

a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan))?

Source: RCIP, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project will be served by Riverside County Waste Management Department. The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new landfill facilities, including the expansion of existing facilities. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

46. Utilities

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

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

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

a-h) No letters have been received eliciting responses that the proposed project would require substantial new facilities or expand facilities. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 47. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Source: Staff review, Project 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.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 48. 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 | <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 |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

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.

49. 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 Materials

Findings of Fact: The project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The project will have no impact.

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

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. The project will have a less than significant impact.

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:

- SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook
- RCIP: Riverside County Integrated Project.
- RCLIS: Riverside County Land Information System
- County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 2144
- County Paleontological Report (PDP) No. 1348
- Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) development review, report dated June 1, 2009

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

- Coachella Valley Water District letter dated December 22, 2008

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 Case Files-Riverside office\PP23890\hearing docs\EA.PP23890.doc

Revised: January 25, 2010