

**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY**

**Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number:** 41610  
**Project Case Type (s) and Number(s):** Tentative Parcel Map No. 34962  
**Lead Agency Name:** County of Riverside Planning Department  
**Address:** P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409  
**Contact Person:** Jeff Horn, Project Planner  
**Telephone Number:** 951-955-4641  
**Applicant's Name:** Andres Vargas and Gina Escobar  
**Applicant's Address:** 23330 Cowie Ave, Perris CA 92570  
**Engineer/Rep. Name:** Archer Engineering  
**Engineer/Rep. Address:** 15205 Lake Mathews Drive, Perris CA 92570

**I. PROJECT INFORMATION**

**A. Project Description:** Tentative Parcel Map No. 34962 is a proposal for a Schedule "H" subdivision of 2.05 net acres into two (2) single family residential lots with a minimum lot size of one (1) gross acre. Parcel 1 is 1.05 net acres and contains an existing residence which shall remain and Parcel 2 is 1.00 net acres.

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

**C. Total Project Area:** 2.05 gross acres

<b>Residential Acres:</b> 2.05	<b>Lots:</b> 2	<b>Units:</b>	<b>Projected No. of Residents:</b> 7
<b>Commercial Acres:</b>	<b>Lots:</b>	<b>Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:</b>	<b>Est. No. of Employees:</b>
<b>Industrial Acres:</b>	<b>Lots:</b>	<b>Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:</b>	<b>Est. No. of Employees:</b>
<b>Other:</b>			

**D. Assessor's Parcel No(s):** 325-220-033

**E. Street References:** The site is located northerly of Deprad Street, southerly of Lopez Street, and easterly of Cowie Street.

**F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:**  
Section 2, Township 4 South, Range 4 West

**G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings:**

The project site is located in a built-out rural residential area. The project site consists of a single family residence on 2.05 gross acres of heavily disturbed land.

**II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS**

**A. General Plan Elements/Policies:**

**1. Land Use:** The proposed project is located within the Mead Valley Area Plan (MVAP), more specifically within the Good Hope community. The project has a Land Use Designation of Rural Community: Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) (One Acre Minimum). The proposed project adheres to the Mead Valley Area Plan and all other applicable General Plan Land Use Policies.

2. **Circulation:** The proposed project will add overall trips in the area. However, the project was reviewed by the Riverside County Transportation Department. Based on their review, the Transportation Department determined that the proposed project would not result in inconsistencies with the General Plan Circulation Levels of Service and that the proposed project is consistent with this General Plan policy. The project meets all other applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.
3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** The proposed project is not located within a Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan Cell or Cell Group. The project site is free from suitable habitat for wildlife, as well as native plant species. The project meets all other applicable multipurpose open space policies of the General plan.
4. **Safety:** The proposed project is not located in a flood zone, fault zone, or high fire area. The project is located in an area susceptible to subsidence and with a low potential for liquefaction. The proposed project meets all other Safety element policies.
5. **Noise:** The project will permanently increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. However, the project will be required to comply with Ordinance 847 which regulates noise. The proposed project meets all other applicable Noise element policies of the General Plan
6. **Housing:** The project proposes a two lot subdivision of 2.05 net acres with an existing single family residence. Therefore, the project does propose the construction of one (1) additional home. The proposed project meets all other Housing element policies of the General Plan.
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):** Mead Valley

**C. Foundation Component(s):** Rural Community (RC)

**D. Land Use Designation(s):** Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) (One Acre Minimum)

**E. Overlay(s), if any:** N/A

**F. Policy Area(s), if any:** N/A

**G. Adjacent and Surrounding Area Plan(s), Foundation Component(s), Land Use Designation(s), and Overlay(s) and Policy Area(s), if any:**

1. **Area Plan:** Mead Valley

2. **Foundation Component:** Rural Community (RC) to the north, south, east and west

3. **Land Use Designation:** Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to the north, south, east and west

4. **Overlay(s), if any:** N/A

5. Policy Area(s), if any: N/A

H. Adopted Specific Plan Information

1. Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any: N/A

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

I. Existing Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R)

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: N/A

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R) to the north, east, south, and west

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics            | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources    | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils         | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing            | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

**A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED**

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

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

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

**A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED**

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

become feasible.

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

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Jeff Horn  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

January 26, 2010

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

For Ron Goldman, Planning Director  
\_\_\_\_\_

**V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT**

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

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

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

Findings of Fact: This project is not located near a scenic highway corridor. The project will not substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

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

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution)

Findings of Fact:

- a) According to the RCIP, the project site is located 17.4 miles away from the Mt. Palomar Observatory; which is within the designated ZONE B Special Lighting Area that surrounds the Mt. Palomar Observatory. Ordinance No. 655 contains approved materials and methods of installation, definition, general requirements, requirements for lamp source and shielding, prohibition and exceptions. With incorporation of project lighting requirements of the Riverside

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

County Ordinance No. 655 into the proposed project, this impact will be reduced to a less than significant impact. A note will be made on the Environmental Constraints Sheet that the properties are located within Zone B of County Ordinance 655 and are subject to outdoor lighting restrictions. (COA 50.PLANNING.21) This is a standard condition of approval and therefore is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

**3. Other Lighting Issues**

a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Description

Findings of Fact:

Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 is applicable to the project site. Therefore, the project must comply with Ordinance No. 655, including, but not limited to Low-Pressure Sodium Voltage (LPSV) street lights. Pursuant to Ordinance No. 655, the project’s onsite lighting will be directed downward or shielded and hooded to avoid shining onto adjacent properties and streets. Furthermore, the amount of lighting will be similar to other residential areas surrounding the site.

The proposed project is not expected to create unacceptable light levels because of conformance with Ordinance No. 655. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or expose residential property to unacceptable light levels. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

a) The proposed project will introduce new sources of nighttime light and glare into the area from rural residential uses. Spill of light onto surrounding properties, and “night glow” can be reduced by using hoods and other design features on light fixtures used within the proposed project. Inclusion of these design features in the project is addressed through standard County conditions of approval, plan checks, permitting procedures, and code enforcement. Potential impacts associated with glare will be reduced to below the level of significance through these standard County practices and procedures and implementation of the below-listed mitigation measure.

b) The proposed project would result in a new source of light and glare. Vehicular lighting would increase from cars traveling to and from the project site. However, this impact would be minimal based on the small number of trips this project would generate.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

**AGRICULTURE RESOURCES** Would the project

<b>4. Agriculture</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract (Riv. Co. Agricultural Land Conservation Contract Maps)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to 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: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database, and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not designated as Urban- Built Up Land: therefore, the project will not 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 uses. Therefore, no impact will occur.

b) The proposed project is located adjacent to single-family residential homes within a rural setting; therefore, the project will have no impact and will not conflict with existing agricultural uses, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract. Therefore, there is no impact.

c) The proposed project is not located adjacent to agriculturally zoned property. The project will not cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property. No impacts related to agriculturally zoned properties are anticipated.

d) The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a Farmland Designation. Therefore, the project will not involve changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

**AIR QUALITY** Would the project

<b>5. Air Quality Impacts</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
applicable air quality plan?				
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"/>
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 Southwest 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

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

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 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. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The proposed project

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

may expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations during project grading and construction. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site include scattered single-family homes to the north, south, east, and west of the project site.

Air emissions will be emitted by construction equipment and fugitive dust will be generated during demolition, site preparation and construction activities. Long-term operational emissions generated by the proposed project will primarily be from motor vehicles. Other emissions will be generated from the combustion of firewood in fireplaces and the combustion of natural gas for space heating and the generation of electricity. In addition, emissions will be generated by the use of natural gas for the generation of electricity off-site. These short-term, construction-related impacts will be reduced below a level of significance by dust control measures implemented during grading (Condition of Approval 10.BS GRADE.5). This is a standard condition of approval therefore is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

- f) Surrounding land uses do not include significant localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants, or odors. As such, no point-source emitters are located within a close proximity to future occupants of the site. Therefore, the project will not involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point-source emitter.
- g) The proposed project will not result in or create objectionable odors. No activities are anticipated to occur on the site that would create odors. No impact is anticipated.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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?

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)?

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?

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors,

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, WRCMSHCP, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project is located within the boundaries of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, more specifically the project is not located within a criteria cell of MSHCP. A MSHCP compliance report was prepared and it concluded that the site lacked native habitats, riparian areas, vernal pools, and other suitable habitats for fairy shrimp. The project will not conflict with the WRCMSHCP, therefore there is a less than significant impact.
- b) An MSHCP compliance report was prepared and it concluded that the site lacked native habitats, riparian areas, vernal pools and other suitable habitats for fairy shrimp. The project does not have the potential to 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 a less than significant impact.
- c) An MSHCP compliance report was prepared and it concluded that the site lacked native habitats, riparian areas, vernal pools and other suitable habitats for fairy shrimp. The project does not have the potential to 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 a less than significant impact.
- d) Review by the Environmental Programs Department concluded that the project did not have the potential to 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 a less than significant impact.
- e) An MSHCP compliance report was prepared and it was determined that the site lacked any riparian areas. The project does not have the potential to substantially effect 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. Therefore, there is a less than significant impact.

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

f) The project site does not contain any area that is designated as a federally protected wetlands, nor is it located within the vicinity of any federally protected wetlands, therefore there is no impact with regard to wetlands.

g) Review by the Environmental Programs Department concluded that the project did conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, therefore there is no impact with regard to conflicting with the protection of biological resources.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

**CULTURAL RESOURCES** Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>7. Historic Resources</b>	<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) No historic sites or resources have been identified within the project boundaries. There is no cause for a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resources as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5 therefore impacts to historic resources are less than significant.

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
<b>8. Archaeological Resources</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

a) The project site will not alter or destroy a known archaeological site.

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

- b) If during ground disturbance activities, unique cultural resources are discovered that were not assessed by the archaeological report(s) and/or environmental assessment conducted prior to project approval, the following procedures shall be followed. Unique cultural resources are defined, for this condition, as being multiple artifacts in close association with each other, but may include fewer artifacts if the area of the find is determined to be of significance due to its sacred or cultural importance. 1. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the archaeologist, the Native American tribal representative and the Planning Director to discuss the significance of the find. 2. At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed and after consultation with the Native American tribal representative and the archaeologist, a decision shall be made, with the concurrence of the Planning Director, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resources. 3. Grading of further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to the appropriate mitigation. (COA 10.PLANNING.8) This is a standard condition and not considered mitigation for CEQA purposes.
- c) If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 5097.98 (b) remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within a reasonable timeframe. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the "most likely descendant." The most likely descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. (COA 10.Planning.07) This is not unique mitigation therefore impacts are less than significant.
- d) There are no known existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area.

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", GIS Database

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the GIS database (RCLIS), the proposed project site is within an area that is designated as having an undetermined potential for paleontological sensitivity. However, the site has already been developed for single family residential purposes and it is not anticipated that the project

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

would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

**GEOLGY AND SOILS** Would the project

<b>10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 “Earthquake Fault Study Zones,” GIS database, Geologist Comments, GEO. No. 2005

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site is not located on a known earthquake fault study zone and therefore will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death
- b) The project site will not 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.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: RCIP Figure S-3 “Generalized Liquefaction,” REMAP Area Plan “Seismic Hazards Figure 12, RCLIS and Geologist Review

Findings of Fact:

- a) This project is located in an area as indicated by the General Plan where there is no potential for liquefaction. The County Geologist has reviewed the proposed project site and concluded that no

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

liquefaction study shall be required therefore there is a determination that no impacts for the determination that impacts relating to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

**12. Ground-shaking Zone**

Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

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

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), Geology Department Review

Findings of Fact: This site is located within a seismically active area of Southern California and should be expected to experience strong seismic shaking during the life time of the proposed project. All structures should be designed in accordance with the provisions of the latest edition of the California Building Code (CBC 2007) for a site classified as Site Class D.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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?

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope," Geology Department Review

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, potentially resulting in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards. Therefore, there is no potential impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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?

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

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

Source: Geology Department Review, RCLIS

Findings of Fact: The project is located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project is less than significant. The project has been reviewed by the County Geology Department; no issues of concern have been raised in regards to landslide risk.

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: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Geology Department Review

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located in an area subject to seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard.

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, Geology Department Review

Findings of Fact:

a-c) Development of the proposed subdivision will not substantially change the existing topography; The project does propose to create slopes at a ratio greater than two to one (2:1) and higher than ten (10) feet, but these conditions are consistent with the existing topography of the project site. The project will not result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**17. Soils**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection, Flood Hazards Report and Geology Department Review

Findings of Fact:

The project will require grading for house pads on each parcel. However, impacts to substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil are less than significant:

- a. The project site will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.
- b. Based on review by the County Geologist, parcel maps in the project area do not require full geotechnical reports. If expansive soils are identified during building, there is sufficient area out side areas of constraint on the proposed four (4) lots for alternative building sites.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: Department of Building and Safety Grading Review, County Flood Department Review

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project will not change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream, or the bead of a lake.
- b) All grading shall conform to the California Building Code, Ordinance 457, and all other relevant laws, rules and regulations governing grading in Riverside County and prior to commencing any grading which includes 50 or more cubic yards, the applicant shall obtain a grading permit from the Building & Safety Department (10.BSGRADE.2)

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

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

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

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, Geology Department Review

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site lies within a high area of wind erosion. (The project will decrease the amount of exposed dirt, which is subject to wind erosion, with the incorporation of concrete and asphalt. A condition has been placed on the project to control dust created during grading activities. This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA (COA 10.BS GRADE.5).

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** Would the project

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>	<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?	<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?	<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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

- a) The development of two (2) residential lots does not have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, therefore there is no impact.

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

b) The development of two (2) residential lots does not have the potential to 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, therefore there is no impact.

c) The development of two (2) residential lots does not have the potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan, therefore there is no impact.

d) The project site is not located within one quarter mile of an existing school, furthermore, the project, development of two (2) residential lots does not have the potential to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, therefore there is no impact.

e) The project, development of two (2) residential lots, is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, therefore there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>21. Airports</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the Riverside County General Plan EIR, the project is not located within the vicinity of an airport master plan, therefore there is no potential for inconsistency. The project will have no potential impact.

b) According to the Riverside County General Plan EIR, the project is not located within the vicinity of an airport master plan, therefore review by the Airport Land Use Commission is not required. The project will have no potential impact.

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

c-d) According to the Riverside County General Plan EIR, the project is not located within the vicinity of an airport master plan or an private airstrip, therefore there is no potential the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The project will have no potential impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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) According to the Riverside County General Plan EIR, the project is not located within an area with a high fire designation, therefore there is no potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The project will have a less than significant impact with regard to hazardous fire areas.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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 stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

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

Source: Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition.

Findings of Fact:

- a) There are no existing watercourses on or in the vicinity of the project site. The project does not have the potential to 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. The project will have a less than significant impact.
- b) The creation of two (2) residential lots will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- c) The project proposed potable water service from Eastern Municipal Water District. The project site currently contains one single family residence for which water service already exists comparable to the demand for the project, therefore sufficient water supply already exists to the site. The project will have a less than significant impact with regard to substantially depleting groundwater supplies or interfering substantially with groundwater recharge.
- d) This project site will not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
- e) Proposed pads are not located within a 100-year zone therefore, the project will 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 maps.
- f) The project will not place any structures within a 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flood flows.
- g) The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.
- h) The project will 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).

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

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

**24. Floodplains**

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

NA - Not Applicable  U - Generally Unsuitable  R - Restricted

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"/>	<input 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 “100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones,” Figure S-10 “Dam Failure Inundation Zone,” Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition, GIS database,

Findings of Fact:

- a. No natural watercourses exist onsite. The project will 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.
- b. The proposed two (2) lot subdivision of 2.05 net acres shall not create changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff.
- c. Proposed pads are not located within a flood plain and will not 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).
- d. The project site will not make changes in the amount of surface water in any water body

Mitigation: No mitigation measures required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures required.

**LAND USE/PLANNING** Would the project

**25. Land Use**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is located within the Rural Community: Very Low Density Residential (RC:VLDR) (1 Acre Minimum) land use designation. The Rural Community foundation component identifies communities in the County that have a rural lifestyle, animal keeping uses and limited infrastructure (General Plan Land Use Element). The Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) land use designation provides for the development of detached single family residential dwellings and ancillary structures on large parcels (General Plan Land Use Element). The proposed subdivision of two (2) lots with a one (1) acre minimum lot size is consistent with the Rural Community: Very Low Density Residential (RC:VLDR) (1 Acre Minimum) Land Use Designation.

b) The project site is not located within a city sphere of influence or adjacent city/county boundaries, therefore there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

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

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

Findings of Fact:

- The project's existing zone is Rural Residential (R-R). The proposed two (2) lot subdivision of 2.05 net acres with a minimum lot size of one (1) gross acre is consistent with the proposed R-R zoning classification.
- The project site is surrounded by properties zoned Rural-Residential (R-R) to the north, east, south, and west. The proposed two (2) lot subdivision of 2.05 net acres with a minimum lot size of one (1) gross acre is consistent with the surrounding zoning classifications.

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

- c. The project is surrounded by vacant land, as well as scattered single-family residential to the north and east. The proposed two (2) lot subdivision of 2.05 net acres with a minimum lot size of one (1) gross acre is consistent with the existing and planned surrounding land use.
- d. The project site has a proposed Land Use Designation of Rural Community: Very Low Density Residential (RC:VLDR) (1 Acre Minimum). The proposed two (2) lot subdivision of 2.05 net acres is consistent with the Rural Community: Very Low Density Residential (RC:VLDR) (1 Acre Minimum) land use designation and with the policies of the Comprehensive General Plan.
- e. The project shall not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community).

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area"

Findings of Fact:

a) Based on Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area," the project is located within MRZ-3 which means that mineral resources are likely to exist, but the significance of such resource is undetermined. The project area has not been used for mining and there are no mining operations within the vicinity of the project. The project would not 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. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) The project site is not delineated on a general plan, local land use plan or any other plan as a mineral resource recovery site, therefore there is no impact.



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

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

Findings of Fact:

The project is not located within the vicinity of a railroad line, therefore there is no potential impact with regard to railroad noise.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

**30. Highway Noise**

NA  A  B  C  D

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located within the vicinity of a highway.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

**31. Other Noise**

NA  A  B  C  D

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

The project does not have the potential to create a potentially significant impact with regard to other noise. The project has no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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?

b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local

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

general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed project will result in the increase of permanent existing ambient noise levels due to the vehicle traffic associated with the on-going operation of a residential development. However, due to the minimal number of additional trips generated through implementation of this project, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.
- b) The proposed project will result in an increase to existing noise levels due to short-term construction activities. Short-term, construction-related noise impacts may occur during project grading and construction. However, the impacts are temporary and considered less than significant.

Time limits on construction involving the operation of powered equipment are established by Riverside County Ordinance 457.90, Section 1G, of the Riverside County Building and Safety Department, states the following: "Whenever a construction site is within one-quarter (.25) a mile of an occupied residence(s), no construction activities shall be undertaken between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., during the months of June through September and between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. during the months of October through May." Exceptions to these standards shall be allowed only with the written consent of the Riverside County Building Official.

- c) The proposed project also has the potential to result in the exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County of Riverside General Plan or noise ordinance, since the project has proposed one (1) additional single family residence. Impacts however, will be less than significant, since noise levels in the project vicinity are typical of a low-density residential area.
- d) The proposed project will not expose a person to excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures required.

**POPULATION AND HOUSING** Would the project

<b>33. Housing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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%	<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
or less of the County's median income?				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed development is for the subdivision of 2.05 net acres into two (2) residential parcels. There is one existing residences on the project site that will remain; therefore the project will increase the housing within the area.
- b) The proposed project will not have a significant impact related to population and housing in Riverside County. However, future development of single-family homes will increase the number of available housing units and the population in the area.
- c) The proposed project will not create permanent employment opportunities; therefore, it will not create a demand for additional housing.
- d-f) The proposed project will not affect a County Redevelopment Area, cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections, or induce substantial population growth in an area directly or indirectly.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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:

<b>34. Fire Services</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact:

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

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 10.PLANNING.20) This is a standard condition of approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

---

**35. Sheriff Services**

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

The project area is serviced by the Riverside County Sheriff 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 10.PLANNING.20) This is a standard condition of approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation..

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

---

**36. Schools**

Source: GIS database

Findings of Fact:

The project will not physically alter or result in the construction of new school facilities. The project is located within the Perris & Perris Union High School District. The project is required to comply with school mitigation fees in accordance with State law (COA 80.Planning.7, 80.Planning.8). This is a standard condition of approval and not considered mitigation for CEQA purposes. The impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

---

**37. Libraries**

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

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: Library services for existing residences on the project site are provided by the Riverside County Public Library System. Development fees are required by the Riverside County Public Library System. The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. Development fees required by the Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 may be used at the County’s discretion to provide additional library facilities. 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 County Ordinance No. 659 in order to mitigate the potential effects to library services. This is a standard condition of approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation. (COA.10.PLANNING.20)

Additionally, the project will not 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. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects will have to meet all applicable environmental standards.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures required.

**38. Health Services**

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The proposed tentative map would cause a less than significant 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 presence of medical communities generally corresponds with the increase in population associated with the new development. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of this project and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures 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

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

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

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).

Findings of Fact:

a-b)The developer is required to pay park fees on all residential units. The developer must for a homeowner’s association to fund the maintenance of any streetscape improvements, detention basin or open space lots.

c) The land divider shall submit to the County Planning Department - Development Review Division a duly and completely executed agreement with the County Service Area which demonstrates to the satisfaction of the County that the land divider has provided for the payment of parks and recreation fees and/or dedication of land for the TENTATIVE MAP in accordance with Section 10.35 of County Ordinance No. 460. The TENTATIVE MAP is located within an area of the County which does not have a CSA. If a CSA forms prior to the TENTATIVE MAP recording it must join the newly formed CSA and is at that time subject to QUIMBY Fees. (COA 50.PLANNING.8 and 90.PLANNING.4) This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures required

Monitoring: No monitoring measures required.

<b>40. Recreational Trails</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Open Space and Conservation Map for Western County trail alignments, “Mead Valley Trails and Bikeways Plan” Figure 8 (MVAP)

Findings of Fact:

According to Figure 8 of the Mead Valley Area Plan (MVAP), no trails are planned for this portion of Mead Valley. The project will have no impact with regard to bike trails.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

<b>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b> Would the project				
---	--	--	--	--

<b>41. Circulation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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)?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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, Transportation Department, Ordinance 348

Findings of Fact:

- a) The Transportation Department reviewed the project and determined that based on the information provided there project would not be required to prepare a traffic study (COA 10. Trans.1). The project is considered to have a less than significant impact with regard to an increase in traffic.
- b) The proposed project has complied with the development standard of Ordinance 348 with regard to Off-Street Vehicle Parking and has adequate parking capacity for the project, thus there is no impact.
- c) The Transportation Department reviewed the project and determined that based on the information provided the project did not have the potential to exceed the level of service standard for the proposed area. The project may have a minimal increase in trips to the site based on the change from an additional single family residence, however the current level of service will not be significantly altered therefore there is a less than significant impact.
- d) The project does not have the potential to change air traffic patterns, therefore there is no impact.
- e) The project does not have the potential to change waterborne, air or rail traffic, therefore there is no impact.
- f) The project is located adjacent to Cowie Avenue and will not be required to make any improvements and/or modifications to the design of the roadway. The project does not have the potential increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment), therefore there is a less than significant impact.
- g) The project is located adjacent to Cowie Avenue and has the potential to increase the roadways within the vicinity of the project site, therefore generating a small increase in the need for maintenance

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

of roads. However, due to the relatively small scale of the increase, impacts related to the maintenance of roads shall be considered less than significant.

h) It is not anticipated that there will be a substantial effect upon circulation during the project's construction. No improvements are proposed within adjacent right of ways and all improvements will occur internally within the project site. Therefore, the improvements are not anticipated to substantially affect circulation in the are and this impacts shall be considered less than significant.

i) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses, therefore there is no potential impact.

j) The project will not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation, therefore there is not potential impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

**42. Bike Trails**

Source: "Mead Valley Trails and Bikeways Plan" Figure 8 (MVAP)

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is located adjacent to Cowie Avenue and according to Figure 8 of the Mead Valley Area Plan no trails are planned for this portion of the Highway. The project will have no impact with regard to bike trails.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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, Eastern Municipal Water District

Findings of Fact:

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

a) The project proposed potable water service from Eastern Municipal Water District. The project site currently contains one single family residence for which water service already exists comparable to the demand for the project, therefore sufficient water supply already exists to the site. The project will have a less than significant impact with regard to water.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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) The project proposes an Onsite Wastewater Treatment System to serve the proposed use. The construction of the new septic system will not have the potential to cause significant environmental effects, therefore the impact is considered less than significant.

b) The project proposes an Onsite Wastewater Treatment System to serve the proposed use, therefore there is no wastewater treatment provider whom serves the area and no potential impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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:

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

a) The proposed project is served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) The proposed project shall comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes, including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan). Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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) Implementation of the project will result in an incremental system capacity demand for energy systems, communication systems, storm water drainage systems, street lighting systems, maintenance of public facilities, including roads and potentially other governmental services. Each of the utility systems, including collection of solid waste, is available at the project site and lines will have to be extended onto the site, which will already be disturbed by grading and other construction activities. These impacts are considered less than significant based on the availability of existing public facilities that support local systems. The project will not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans.

Compliance with the requirements of Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas, SBC, Riverside County Flood Control and Riverside County Transportation Department will ensure that potential impacts to utility systems are reduced to a non-significant level.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

47. Does the project have the potential to substantially	<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
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

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 impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of other current projects)?

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

49. 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.

**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:

Riverside County Integrated Project (General Plan) dated October 7, 2003

---

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

---

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

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

JH:jh

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\PM34962\DH\EA41610 (PM34962) DH 3-8-10.doc  
Revised: 6/9/08