

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 41253

Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Change of Zone No. 7484, Tentative Parcel Map No. 33789

Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department

Address: P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409

Contact Person: Matt Straite, Project Planner

Telephone Number: (951)955-8631

Applicant's Name: Ken Gomez

Applicant's Address: 42145 Lyndie Lane, Suite #204, Temecula, CA 92591

Engineer's Name: Megaland Engineers & Associates

Engineer's Address: 28441 Rancho California Road, Ste. 205, Temecula, CA 92590

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description:

Change of Zone No. 7484 proposes to change the zoning classification from Residential Agricultural- 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Residential Agricultural- 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5).

Tentative Parcel Map No. 33789 is a Schedule H subdivision of 20.22 acres into four (4) residential parcels with a minimum lot size of five (5) acres.

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

C. Total Project Area: 20.22 Gross Acres

Residential Acres: 20.22	Lots: 4	Units:	Projected No. of Residents: 12
Commercial Acres: N/A	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Industrial Acres: N/A	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Other: N/A			

D. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 930-310-003

E. Street References: Northeasterly of Calle de Sueños, southerly of Avenida La Cresta, and southwesterly of the terminus of Paseo de Flores

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:
Township 7 South, Range 4 West, Section 21

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The proposed project is located in the Southwest Area of the RCIP, more specifically, on the Santa Rosa Plateau. The project site contains ten (10) acres of avocado groves with approximately ten (10) acres of grassland with areas of Engelmann oaks. A majority of the southwestern portion of the project site consists of slopes of 25 percent or greater. The proposed pad sites have adequately avoided areas of the site with slopes of 25 percent or greater. Two well-defined watercourses flow from the property's eastern boundary. These two watercourses meet further downstream near the property line which separates Parcel 1 and Parcel 2. A third watercourse flows along the property's western boundary. This area has historically supported agricultural cultivation, but has recently begun a transition to estate residential uses.

The site is surrounded by vacant land to the north, south, and west and a large-lot, single-family home and vacant land to the east

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. **Land Use:** The project is located in the Southwest Area Plan of the RCIP. The land use designation is Rural: Rural Mountainous (R:RM) (10 Acre Minimum) General Plan designation and the project is located in the Santa Rosa/ De Luz Policy Area which permits 5 acre lots pending some conditions, all of which this project meets.
2. **Circulation:** The project does not impact any transportation facilities referenced in the General Plan and meets all other applicable circulation policies.
3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** This project avoids natural watercourses, flood plains, and will preserve oak trees.
4. **Safety:** The project is located in a high fire area and has been reviewed by the Fire Department and the Transportation Land Management Agency (S 5.6) and will implement fire safety standards.
5. **Noise:** Existing land uses in the project vicinity will not present noise compatibility issues with the proposed project (N 1.4).
6. **Housing:** The project provides the appropriate number of housing units for the site pursuant to its General Plan land use designation.
7. **Air Quality:** The project proposes residential uses, which are considered sensitive receptors. The project uses are separated and protected from polluting point sources (AQ 2.1).

B. **General Plan Area Plan(s):** Southwest Area

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

D. **Land Use Designation(s):** Rural Mountainous (RM) (10 Acre Minimum)

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

F. **Policy Area(s), if any:** Santa Rosa Plateau/ De Luz Policy Area

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(s):** Southwest Area Plan
2. **Foundation Component(s):** Rural
3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Rural Mountainous (RM) (10 Acre Minimum)
4. **Overlay(s) and Policy Area(s), if any:** Santa Rosa Plateau/ De Luz Policy Area

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: Residential Agricultural- 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10)

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: Residential Agricultural- 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5)

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Residential Agricultural – 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) to the north, Residential Agricultural – 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to the north, south, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input 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

October 15, 2008

Date

Matt Straite

Printed Name

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
AESTHETICS Would the project				
1. Scenic Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-7 “Scenic Highways”

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project is located on the Santa Rosa Plateau. Portions of the Plateau are visible from Interstate 15, which is designated a State Eligible Scenic Highway; however, the project site is not visible from Interstate 15, and will not have an impact on Scenic Highways.
- b) The project is located on the Santa Rosa Plateau in southwest Riverside County. The surrounding area can be characterized by rural and estate-style development. Local aesthetic concerns include negative impacts from the clearing and grading of hillsides, the avoidance of oak trees, and the preservation of natural watercourses. The project proposes grading or ground-disturbing activities to support four building pads, driveways, and septic systems. However, manufactured slopes adjacent to the proposed building pads and driveways have been minimized in accordance with the Santa Rosa Plateau / De Luz Policy Area requirements. Two (2) Engelmann oak trees located on site will be preserved and the three (3) natural watercourses located on site will be avoided.

Mitigation:

- 1) The proposed project will be required to preserve oak trees which are located on site in accordance with the County’s Oak Tree Management Guidelines (Conditions of Approval 10.Planning.9, 50. Planning.10, and 60. Planning.5 and 18).
- 2) Each of the watercourses shall be delineated and labeled on the Environmental Constraint Sheet (ECS) to accompany the Final Map. The natural watercourses shall be kept free of all buildings and obstructions (Condition of Approval 50.Flood Ri.3).

Monitoring: The mitigation measures will be monitored by the Building and Safety Department and Riverside County Flood Control District.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory

a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through [Riverside County Ordinance No. 655](#)?

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The intent of Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 is to restrict the use of certain light fixtures emitting into the night sky undesirable light rays which have a detrimental effect on astronomical observation and research. The project is located approximately 28.35 miles from the Mt. Palomar Observatory and is in Zone B of Ordinance No. 655. Zone B proscribes preferred types of lighting fixtures (i.e. low-pressure sodium lamps), shielding requirements, hours of operation, and regulates outdoor advertising display. With adherence to project mitigation measures, specifically adherence to Ordinance No. 655, any negative impacts to the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory can be reduced to a less than significant level. 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.24). This is a standard condition of approval and not considered unique mitigation for CEQA purposes.

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:

a-b) The proposed residential land use will necessitate the installation of outdoor lighting for the maintenance of public safety and security. The County of Riverside has established standards for the design, placement, and operation of outdoor lighting. These standards set forth the preferred lighting source, identify maximum lighting intensity, dictate shielding requirements, and establish hours of operation. Since these standards are imposed on all outdoor lighting sources, they are not considered unique mitigation for CEQA purposes. While the proposed development will increase the distribution of light in the vicinity of the project, impacts will be less than significant level with adherence to County lighting standards.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database, and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) According to RCLIS (GIS database), a portion of the proposed project site is designated as Unique Farmland. Approximately 20.22 acres of agricultural lands will be directly and permanently affected/converted by the project to a non-agricultural use. The impacts of converting properties from agricultural to residential uses are included in a Certified Environmental Impact Report previously prepared for the 2003 Riverside County Integrated Project. The General Plan determined that the loss of prime, unique, and farmland of statewide importance remains a significant unavoidable impact of implementing the adopted General Plan. The project proposes land uses and land use intensities which are consistent with the adopted General Plan. The project could contribute to the cumulative loss of farmland in the County. The Board of Supervisors found that there were no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that could have satisfied the loss of prime Farmland designated for statewide importance. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors adopted the findings of overriding considerations on October 7, 2003. The project will not cause additional impacts to agricultural resources which have not been previously analyzed; therefore the project will not cause a significant impact to agricultural lands.

b) According to RCLIS (GIS database), the proposed project site is not located in the vicinity of any agricultural preserves. The proposed project will not conflict with any Williamson Act Contracts; therefore, there a less than significant impact will occur.

c) According to RCLIS (GIS database), the proposed project site is not located within 300 feet of any land zoned primarily for agricultural use, therefore there is a less than significant impact.

d) As stated in Finding of Fact 4a, the proposed project is designated as Unique Farmland. However, the project proposes land uses and land use intensities which are consistent with the adopted General

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

Plan. The project will not involve changes in the existing environment which have not been previously analyzed. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. Air Quality Impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is responsible for developing a regional air quality management plan to ensure compliance with state and federal air quality standards. The SCAQMD has adopted the 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The primary implementation responsibility assigned to the County (i.e. local governments) by the 2003 AQMP is the implementation of air quality control measures associated with transportation facilities. This project does not propose any transportation facilities that would require transportation control measures, and therefore will not obstruct implementation of the AQMP.

a) The 2003 AQMP is based on socio-economic forecasts (including population estimates) provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The County General Plan is consistent with SCAG's Regional Growth Management Plan and SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan. This project is consistent with the General Plan land use designations, and population estimates. The population proposed by this project will not obstruct the implementation of the 2003 AQMP. Therefore, there is no impact.

b) Air quality impacts would occur during site preparation, including grading and equipment exhaust. Major sources of fugitive dust are a result of grading and site preparation during construction by vehicles and equipment and generated by construction vehicles and equipment traveling over exposed surfaces, as well as by soil disturbances from grading and filling. These short-term,

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

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.

c) The project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment status pursuant to an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.

d) A sensitive receptor is a person in the population who is particularly susceptible to health effects due to exposure to an air contaminant than is the population at large. Sensitive receptors (and the facilities that house them) in proximity to localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants or odors are of particular concern. High levels of CO are associated with major traffic sources, such as freeways and major intersections, and toxic air contaminants are normally associated with manufacturing and commercial operations. Land uses considered to be sensitive receptors include long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. Surrounding land uses include residential homes, which are considered sensitive receptors; however, the project is not expected to generate substantial point-source emissions. The project will not include major transportation facilities, commercial or manufacturing uses, or generate significant odors. Therefore, there is no impact.

e) Surrounding uses do not include significant localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants or odors. Therefore, the proposed project will not involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point-source emitter. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

f) The project proposes a residential development and will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Wildlife & Vegetation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: GIS database, WRCMSHCP, On-site Inspection, Environmental Programs Department Review

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project is not located within a Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Criteria Cell. However, the onsite natural watercourses meet the criteria outlined under Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP for riverine/riparian habitat and must be avoided. The Environmental Constraints Sheet (ECS) will be required to show the watercourses as an area not to be disturbed (Condition of Approval 50.Flood Ri.3). The provision of the non-disturbance area on the ECS will meet the goals of adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Conservation Community Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plans. In addition, potential habitat is present for San Miguel Savory, but none were observed on site during field surveys. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant after mitigation.

b) The County of Riverside Environmental Programs Department did not identify the presence of any endangered or threatened species which are listed in the Title 14 of the California Codes of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12). However, as stated in Finding of Fact 6a, the natural watercourse will be completely avoided, lessening impacts to biological resources protected under the MSHCP. Therefore, no impacts related to threatened or endangered species are anticipated.

c) The project has been required to avoid the natural watercourse which traverses the site (refer to Finding of Fact 6a). The avoidance of said watercourse will reduce impacts, either directly or through habitat modifications, on those species identified as 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. The Environmental Programs Department determined that the natural watercourse qualified as a riverine/riparian habitat pursuant to the MSHCP, Section 6.1.2. Therefore, the natural must be avoided. Impacts are expected to be less than significant after mitigation.

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

d) With avoidance of the natural watercourse, the proposed project will not interfere 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, less than significant impacts to wildfire corridors are anticipated.

e) The project site does contain drainage features and riparian/riverine habitat (refer to Finding of Fact 6a). However, the riparian/riverine habitat will be completely avoided through an Environmental Constraints Sheet (ECS) on the Final Map prior to recordation (Condition of Approval 50.Flood Ri.3). Therefore, less than significant impacts after mitigation are expected.

f) The Environmental Programs Department did not identify the natural watercourse as 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. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, there is no impact.

g) Engelmann oak trees are located on site and particularly within areas designated as riverine/riparian habitat. These oak trees will be protected through an ECS on the Final Map prior to recordation as described in Finding of Fact 6a (Condition of Approval 50.Flood Ri.3). The proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, less than significant impact will occur after mitigation.

Mitigation:

1) The proposed project will be required to preserve oak trees which are located on site in accordance with the County's Oak Tree Management Guidelines (Conditions of Approval 10.Planning.9, 50. Planning.10, and 60. Planning.5 and 18).

2) Each of the watercourses shall be delineated and labeled on the Environmental Constraint Sheet (ECS) to accompany the Final Map. The natural watercourses shall be kept free of all buildings and obstructions (Condition of Approval 50.Flood Ri.3).

Monitoring: The mitigation measures will be monitored by the Building and Safety Department and Riverside County Flood Control District.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. Historic Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, PD-A 4208 Cultural Resource Assessment by Robert White dated June 28, 2006

Findings of Fact:

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

a) A Cultural Resource Assessment dated June 28, 2006 found no record of a historic site within the boundaries of the project site. The project has a very low potential to alter or destroy a historic site. The project will have a less than significant impact.

b) A Cultural Resources Assessment dated June 28, 2006 explained that the project is located within the vicinity of five archeological sites. However, the closest site is approximately three-quarters of a mile away from the proposed project. Due to the distance to the closest prehistoric resources and the lack of historic resources at the site, the project will have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

8. Archaeological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, PD-A 4208 Cultural Resource Assessment by Robert White dated June 28, 2006

Findings of Fact:

a-b) A Cultural Resources Assessment dated June 28, 2006 explained that the project is located within the vicinity of five archeological sites. However, the closest site is approximately three-quarters of a mile away from the proposed project. In the event that an inadvertent archeological find occurs during ground-disturbing activities, the project is required to stop grading and meet with the Planning Director, as well as the appropriate Native American Tribe to determine the significance of the uncovered resource (Condition of Approval 10.Planning.2). In addition, the project is required to have Native American Tribal Monitors present during ground disturbing activities (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.2). The project is required to have an archeologist retained prior to commencing grading activities to discuss the potential impact to archeological resources (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.3). The project is required to have a cultural resources disposition agreement in place with the appropriate Native American Tribe prior to commencing ground-disturbing activities (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.4). Due to the distance of the closest cultural resources and the lack of resources on site, the project will have a less than significant impact with the incorporated mitigation.

c) The project proposes ground-disturbing activities which have the potential to uncover human remains. The project has been conditioned to contact the Riverside County Coroner's office in the event that human remains area discovered (Condition of Approval 10.Planning.1). This is a standard

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

condition of approval and not considered unique mitigation for CEQA purposes. The project will have a less than significant impact.

d) A Cultural Resources Assessment dated June 28, 2006 did not identify the project site as being used for religious or sacred uses. The project will have no impact with regard to restricting existing religious or sacred uses.

Mitigation:

1) In the event that an inadvertent archeological find occurs during ground-disturbing activities, the project is required to stop grading and meet with the Planning Director, as well as the appropriate Native American Tribe to determine the significance of the uncovered resource (COA. 10. Planning, 2). In addition, the project is required to have Native American Tribal Monitors present during ground disturbing activities (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.2). The project is required to have an archeologist retained prior to commencing grading activities to discuss the potential impact to archeological resources (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.3). The project is required to have a cultural resources disposition agreement in place with the appropriate Native American Tribe prior to commencing ground-disturbing activities (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.4).

Monitoring: Monitoring will occur through the Planning Department and the Department of Building and Safety through the plan check process.

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," PD-A 4208 Cultural Resource Assessment by Robert White dated June 28, 2006

Findings of Fact:

a) According to RCLIS (GIS database) the proposed project is located in an area which is deemed to have an undetermined potential for paleontological sensitivity. A Cultural Resource Assessment dated June 28, 2006 suggested that the project retain a paleontologist to inspect possible fossil exposure during ground-disturbing activities. The project was conditioned to retain a paleontologist (COA. 60. Planning. 1). The project will have a less than significant impact with the incorporated mitigation.

Mitigation:

1) The land divider/permit holder shall retain a qualified paleontologist (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.1).

Monitoring: Monitoring will occur through the Planning Department and the Department of Building and Safety through the plan check process.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project

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

10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 “Earthquake Fault Study Zones,” GIS database, Geologist Comments

Findings of Fact:

a-b) According to RCLIS (GIS database) the proposed project is not located within one-half mile of a earthquake fault and is not located within an earthquake fault zone; therefore, there will be no impacts associated with the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects. Additionally, the project will not place people in an area subject to possible earthquake fault rupture.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 “Generalized Liquefaction”

Findings of Fact:

a) According to RCLIS (GIS database), the proposed project is located in an area which has no potential for liquefaction; therefore, no impact related to liquefaction is expected.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

12. Ground-shaking Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. 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)

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

Findings of Fact:

a) According to General Plan Figure S-4 the proposed project site is not located in an area which is susceptible to landslide risk as a result of seismic activity. Figure S-13 of the General Plan indicates that the proposed project site is located in an area that has a very high ground-shaking risk. The proposed development will be required to comply with the latest edition of the California Building Code (CBC 2007) which takes into consideration earthquake risk. This requirement is not considered unique mitigation for CEQA purposes. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact with regard to ground shaking.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

13. Landslide Risk

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) According to Figure S-9, the proposed project is located within an area which has a variety of slopes which range from 15 percent to greater than 30 percent. The project engineer prepared a slope analysis which shows that the site has slopes greater than 25 percent in the northern three-quarters of the parcel. The County Geologist has required that all fill slopes are uniformly compacted to a minimum of 90 percent of the maximum dry density of the slope face (Condition of Approval 10.Planning.9). This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA; therefore, the project will have a less than significant impacts related to landslide potential.

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?

Source: Resolution No. 94-125

Findings of Fact:

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

a) According to RCLIS (GIS database), the proposed project is not located in a subsistence area; therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

15. Other Geologic Hazards

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

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project is not located within an area that is subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

16. Slopes

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

a. Change topography or ground surface relief features?

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

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

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

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project proposes minimal grading which may slightly alter the site's natural topography. However, this impact is less than significant. The proposed project will not substantially alter ground surface relief features. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) The proposed project has been conditioned to limit the steepness of slopes to a ratio of 2:1 unless otherwise approved (Condition of Approval 10.BS Grade.7). This is a standard condition of approval and is, therefore, not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

c) No infiltration lines will be disturbed during project grading or construction, since no lines currently exist onsite. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems. Therefore, there is no impact.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

17. Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<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, Geology Review

Findings of Fact:

a) Graded, but undeveloped land, shall provide in to erosion control planting any drainage facilities deemed necessary to control or prevent erosion. Additional erosion protection may be required during the rainy season from October 15th to April 15th (Condition of Approval 10.BS Grade.4). There requirements are typical conditions of approval and are not considered unique mitigation for CEQA purposes. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) Review by the County Geologist did not indentify expansive soils as an issue of concern. Therefore, the site is considered as exhibiting a low expansion potential. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

18. Erosion	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<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: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) As proposed the project would avoid the natural watercourses on site. Graded slopes which may infringe into the 100-year storm flow floodway boundaries shall be protected form erosion or other flood hazards by a method acceptable to the Building and Safety Departments District Grading Engineer which may include Riverside County Flood Control District's review and approval. However, no graded slope will be allowed which concentrates or diverts drainage flows (Condition of Approval 10.BS Grade.11). With implementation of these measures which are considered standard condition of approval, the project will not have an impact or change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may

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

modify the channel of a river, stream, or the bed of a lake. Impacts are, therefore, are considered less than significant.

b) As discussed in Finding of Fact 18a, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site with implementation of the above-stated conditions of approval. The project has been required to accept and properly dispose of all off-site drainage flowing onto or through the site (Condition of Approval 10.Trans.2). This is a standard condition of approval and not considered unique mitigation for CEQA purposes. Impacts related to water erosion are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site lies within a moderate area of wind erosion. The project site is not anticipated to be impacted by blowsand from off site because current levels of wind erosion on adjacent properties that would impact this site are considered less than significant. A condition has been placed on the project to control dust created during grading activities (Condition of Approval 10 BS.Grade.5). This is a standard condition and, therefore, is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 project proposes residential land uses; therefore, the project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed project will be located on land, which is currently being used for growing avocados and apples. The use of pesticides may occur as a result of these agricultural uses. Since the avocado and apple orchards currently exist, the current use of pesticides is considered part of the baseline, or existing conditions. It is not anticipated that the proposed use would increase the use of pesticides or other hazardous materials on site. The amount of pesticides is minimal due to the size of the parcels and the proposed development, thus resulting in a less than significant impact.

b) The project proposes residential land uses; therefore, the project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

c) The project will provide adequate access to the proposed residential use and will not encroach onto public right-of-way; the project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan.

d) The project proposes residential land uses and no schools are located within one-quarter mile of the project site. Therefore, the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

e) The project 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, it would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

21. Airports	<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	<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
Commission?				
c. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<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 RCLIS (GIS database), the proposed project is not located in the vicinity of an airport; therefore, there will be no impact to an Airport Master Plan.
- b) According to RCLIS (GIS database), the proposed project is not located in the vicinity of an airport; therefore, it is not required to be reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission.
- c) According to RCLIS (GIS database), the proposed project is not located within the vicinity of an airport; therefore, it is not located within an airport land use plan and will not result in a safety hazard for people living on the property.
- d) According to RCLIS (GIS database), the proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or heliport; therefore, there is no impact in relation to safety hazards for people residing in the area.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

22. Hazardous Fire Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 RCLIS (GIS database), the proposed project is located in a high fire area. The project has been reviewed by the Riverside County Fire Department to ensure that the design is suitable for this area and the safety of residents is ensured. To this end, the Environmental Constraints Sheet (ECS) must be stamped by the Riverside County Surveyor with the following note: driveways exceeding 150 feet in length, but less than 800 feet, shall provide a turnout (Condition of Approval 50.Fire.3). In addition, the map will be required to show a 100-foot setback between residential

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

structures. This high fire requirement will be verified prior to the issuance of a grading permit (Condition of Approval 60.Fire.6). With these mitigation measures listed above, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation:

- 1) The ECS map must be stamped by the Riverside County Surveyor with the following note: driveways exceeding 150 feet in length, but less than 800 feet, shall provide a turnout. An approved turn-around shall be provided at all building sites on driveways over 150 feet in length, and shall be within 50 feet of the building (Condition of Approval 50.Fire.3).
- 2) The Fire Department shall review and approve building setbacks, water and access for new single-family dwellings that are in a hazardous fire area (Condition of Approval 60.Fire.6).

Monitoring: Monitoring will occur through the Fire Department and the Department of Building and Safety through the plan check process.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
23. Water Quality Impacts		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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	<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
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors and odors)?

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

Findings of Fact:

a) Three watercourses impact the site. Two well-defined watercourses with drainage areas of eighteen (18) and four (4) acres, respectively, impact the property's eastern boundary. These two watercourses converge downstream near the property line which separates Parcel 1 and Parcel 2. A third watercourse with a watershed area of twenty-five (25) acres impacts the property's western portion. The project proposes a culverts under each of the proposed driveways.

The project has the potential to alter the course of a stream, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. However, the boundaries of the stream shall be protected from erosion, by a method acceptable to the Building and Safety Department District Grading Engineer. The project includes grading to create four (4) residential building pads and associated driveways. However, the stream will not be adversely affected by grading or construction, since no graded slopes will be allowed which in the professional judgment of the District Grading Engineer blocks, concentrates or diverts drainage flows (Condition of Approval 10.BS Grade.11). All three of the natural watercourses will be kept free of buildings and obstructions in order to maintain the natural drainage patterns of the area (Condition of Approval 10.Flood Ri.2). Therefore, the project is not anticipated to substantially alter the existing drainage patterns of the project site. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.

b) The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, there is no impact.

c) Water service will be supplied by the Western Municipal Water District. The proposed project will not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted). Therefore, there is no impact.

d) During the construction and grading phase of development, the project has the potential to contribute to additional polluted runoff water. However, the project will not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. The project will be required to provide for adequate drainage facilities and/or appropriate easements should the project exceed current capacity (Conditions of Approval 10.TRANS.1). This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

e) The proposed project is not located within a 100-year flood zone. However, natural watercourses traverse the site. The parcel layout and building pads have been designed to minimize encroachment into the watercourse (Condition of Approval 10.Flood Ri.2). 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 map. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

f) The proposed project is not located within a 100-year flood zone. However, as mentioned in Finding of Fact 23e, a natural watercourses traverse the site. The project design will minimize

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

encroachment into the watercourse. The project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

g) The proposed project is not anticipated to substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, there is no impact.

h) The site has been designed to minimize drainage infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed project does not include the construction of new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands). Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation:

1) No graded slopes will be allowed which in the professional judgment of the District Grading Engineer blocks, concentrates or diverts drainage flows (Condition of Approval 10.BS Grade.11).

2) All three of the natural watercourses will be kept free of buildings and obstructions in order to maintain the natural drainage patterns of the area (Condition of Approval 10.Flood Ri.2).

Monitoring: Monitoring will occur through the Building and Safety Department and the Department of Building and Safety through the plan check process.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

a) Three watercourses impact the site. The site has been designed to minimize drainage infrastructure and the natural watercourses will be kept clear of all buildings and obstructions

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

(Condition of Approval 50.Flood Ri.3). The stream will not undergo alterations and will not receive a substantial amount of surface runoff in a manner that could result in flooding on or off site. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation.

b) Since the project proposes additional impervious surfaces, the existing absorption rates and the amount of surface runoff would be affected. However, due to the minimum lot size requirements of the project (five-acre minimum) and the amount of additional impervious surfaces, offsite flows would not be affected by implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

c) The proposed project would 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. The project site is not located in an area susceptible to the impacts of the failure of a levee or dam. Therefore, there is no impact.

d) The proposed project is not expected to change the amount of surface water in any body of water. No buildings or obstructions will be allowed to block, concentrate or divert drainage flows as stated in Finding of Fact 24a. Therefore, less than significant impacts to the amount of surface water are expected.

Mitigation:

- 1) No graded slopes will be allowed which in the professional judgment of the District Grading Engineer blocks, concentrates or diverts drainage flows (Condition of Approval 10.BS Grade.11).
- 2) All three of the natural watercourses will be kept free of buildings and obstructions in order to maintain the natural drainage patterns of the area (Condition of Approval 10.Flood Ri.2).

Monitoring: Monitoring will occur through the Fire Department and the Department of Building and Safety through the plan check process.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
25. Land Use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is proposing residential uses which are in compliance with the future anticipated growth on the Santa Rosa Plateau. The proposed project will not result in an alteration of the present or planned land use of this area.

b) According to RCLIS (GIS Database), the proposed project is not located within a city sphere of influence or adjacent to a city or county; therefore, there will be no impact.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project site is currently zoned Residential Agricultural - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10). The project proposes to change the existing zoning classification of the site to Residential Agricultural - 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5). The proposed development will be in compliance with the standards for the proposed zoning, R-A-5.

b) The site is surrounded by land which is zoned Residential Agricultural - 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) and Residential Agricultural - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10), therefore the proposed project is compatible with the existing surrounding zoning.

c) The proposed project is surrounded by vacant land and single-family residences. The project is proposing residential uses which will be compatible with existing and future land uses in the area.

d) The land use designation for the proposed project site is Rural: Rural Mountainous (R:RM) (10 Acre Minimum). According to Southwest Area Policy 5.1, parcels located within the Santa Rosa Plateau/ De Luz Policy Area are allowed a minimum lot size of five (5) acres within the R:RM land use designation. With employment of the policy the proposed project will be consistent with the land use designation and policies of the General Plan.

e) The proposed project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

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

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project				
27. Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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) The proposed project is located within an area designates as MRZ-3a: Areas where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist. However, the significance of the deposits is undetermined. The project area has not been used for mining. Therefore, 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 has not been used for mineral resources; therefore, the project will not 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. Therefore, there is no impact.
- c) Surrounding the project site are residential homes on large lots and vacant land. There are no existing surface mines surrounding the project site; therefore, the project will be compatible with the surrounding uses and will not be located adjacent to a State classified, designated area, or existing surface mine. Therefore, there is no impact.
- d) The project site is not located adjacent or near an abandoned quarry mine; therefore, the project will not expose people or property to hazards from quarry mines. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

NOISE Would the project result in		
Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings		
Where indicated below, the appropriate Noise Acceptability Rating(s) has been checked.		
NA - Not Applicable	A - Generally Acceptable	B - Conditionally Acceptable
C - Generally Unacceptable	D - Land Use Discouraged	

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

28. Airport Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed project site is not located within an Airport Influence Area; therefore, the project will not expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels related to air traffic. Therefore, no impacts are expected.
- b) The proposed project site is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels. No impacts are expected.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

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

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

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of any railroads. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of a major highways. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

31. Other Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Project Application Materials, Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS), County Ordinance No. 847 (Regulating Noise in Riverside County)

Findings of Fact:

a) Short-term, construction-related noise impacts may occur during project grading and construction. However, construction activities will be required to comply with County noise standards. Since the construction site is within one-quarter mile of an occupied residence, 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. All construction vehicles, equipment fixed or mobile shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers. During construction, best efforts will be made to locate stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas as far as practical from existing residential dwellings (Condition of Approval 10.PLANNING.20). This is a standard condition of approval and is, therefore, not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

32. Noise Effects on or by the Project

a. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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 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?

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

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project will raise ambient noise levels in the area which currently exist without the project. However, the project shall not create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. The project proposes the creation of five-acre residential lots which are similar in intensity to neighboring properties. The development of the proposed project will not substantially increase ambient noise levels. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

b) The proposed project may create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project during construction. As discussed in Finding of Fact 31a, construction hours would be limited due to the close proximity of the project site to occupied residences. This is a standard condition of approval and is, therefore, not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Impacts are considered less than significant.

c) The proposed project will not expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance (County Ordinance No. 847), or applicable standards of other agencies. Exterior noise levels will be limited to less than or equal to 45 dB(A) 10-minute LEQ between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., and 65 dB(A) at all other times pursuant to County Ordinance No. 847. Therefore, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

d) The proposed project will not exposure people to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
33. Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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	<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
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

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

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed project site is currently vacant; thus, the proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- b) The proposed project will not create permanent employment opportunities; therefore, it will not create a demand for additional housing.
- c) The proposed project site is currently vacant; therefore, it will not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- d) The project is not located within or near a County Redevelopment Project Area.
- e) The project proposes the addition of four (4) residential parcels, which equates to an increase of twelve (12) additional personas. This population increase will not exceed official regional or local population projections.
- f) The project will not induce substantial population growth in an area.

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:

34. Fire Services

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact:

The proposed project will have an incremental increase in the potential need for fire services. The proposed project shall be required to pay development impact fees established by Ordinance No. 659. Upon compliance with Ordinance No. 659.10 (Condition of Approval 10.Planning.16), the proposed project will not have a significant impact on fire services.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

35. Sheriff Services

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

The proposed project will have an incremental increase in the potential need for sheriff services. This increase will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the payment of fees. Upon compliance with Ordinance No. 659.10 (Condition of Approval 10.Planning.16), the proposed project will not have a significant impact on sheriff services.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

36. Schools

Source: GIS database

Findings of Fact:

The project site is located within the Murrieta Unified School District. The project will comply with State laws regarding any school fees (Condition of Approval 80.Planning.8). This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation for CEQA purposes.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

37. Libraries

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

The proposed subdivision will result in an incremental increased demand for library services. This increase will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the payment of fees. Upon compliance with Ordinance No. 659.10 (Condition of Approval 10.Planning.16),, the project will not have a significant impact on library services.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
38. Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

The use of the proposed 20.22-acre parcel would cause an incremental 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 an increase in population associated with new development. As such, no mitigation is necessary.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

RECREATION

39. Parks and Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Is the project located within a C.S.A. or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS); County Ordinance No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications); County Ordinance No. 659.10 (Establishing Development Impact Fees)

Findings of Fact:

a) The scope of the proposed project does not involve the construction of expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) Future residents of the project site could potentially use neighboring recreational facilities. Due to the size of the proposed development, which entails the addition of approximately 12 persons to the area, it is not anticipated that the project will generate significant impacts to nearby parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

c) The proposed project could potentially incrementally increase the use of some types of recreational facilities in the Southwest Planning Area. The project site is not located within a Community Service Area (CSA). However, if a CSA forms prior to the Tentative Map recordation, it

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

must join the newly formed CSA and will be subject to Quimby fees at that time (Conditions of Approval 50.Planning.7 and 90.Planning.4). This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered unique mitigation under CEQA. Thus, impacts would not be considered significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

40. Recreational Trails

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

Source: Open Space and Conservation Map for Western County trail alignments

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project has not incorporated any trails into its design, therefore the project will have no impact on recreational trails.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

41. Circulation

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

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

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

b. Result in inadequate parking capacity?

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

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

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

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

e. Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?

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?

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

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

alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Source: RCIP, Department of Transportation Review

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed project will increase vehicular traffic; however, The Transportation Department did not require a traffic study for the proposed project. The project will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic loads and capacity of the street system. The impact is considered less than significant.
- b) The project site meets all parking requirements of Ordinance 348 Section 18.12 "Off-Street Parking." Therefore, there is no impact.
- c) Since the project was not required to submit a traffic study, as stated in Finding of Fact 41a, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would exceed levels of service standards established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated road or highways. Therefore, there is no impact.
- d) The proposed project is not located within an Airport Influence Area. The project will not change air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. Therefore, there is no impact.
- e) The proposed project will not change or alter waterborne, rail or air traffic. Therefore, there is no impact.
- f) The proposed project will not substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment). Therefore, there is no impact.
- g) The proposed subdivision will create the need for additional right-of-way. The landowner/developer shall dedicate for private use sufficient public right-of-way along Paseo de Flores to construct a 60-foot, full-width right-of-way (Condition of Approval 50.Trans.10). These transportation requirements are considered standard conditions of approval and are not considered unique mitigation under CEQA. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.
- h) It is not anticipated that there will be a substantial effect upon circulation during the proposed project's construction. The project will result in road improvements to the streets discussed in Finding of Fact 41g. However, the improvements are not anticipated to substantially inhibit circulation in the area. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.
- i) The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses. Therefore, there is no impact.
- j) The proposed project will not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks). Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

42. Bike Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is not located adjacent to or nearby any designated bike trails. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

43. Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project is served by the Western Municipal Water District and will not result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, there is no impact.

b) The proposed project will be served by the Western Municipal Water District. Therefore, it is anticipated that the project will have sufficient water supplies available and would not require new or expanded entitlements to serve the project. Therefore, the impact is considered 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
44. Sewer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project will result in the construction of septic tanks. However, the construction of this new wastewater treatment system is not anticipated to cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) The proposed project has adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the project site; therefore, the project will not result in service that has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: RCIP, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project is relatively small and will not generate significant amounts of construction or demolition waste. The project will be served by Riverside County Waste Management Department. The proposed project will not require nor result in the construction of new landfill facilities, including the expansion of existing facilities.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

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

46. Utilities

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

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

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

a,b,c) The project proposes the addition of four residential dwelling. The project will require utility services in the form of electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications. Each of the utility systems 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. Compliance with the requirements of Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas, and the telephone company will ensure that potential impacts to utility systems are reduced to a non-significant level.

d) Storm water drainage will be handled off site.

e) Cumulative traffic impacts from the project will result in the need for additional street lights. Electricity 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.

f) Based on data available at this time, no offsite utility improvements will be required to support this project.

g) The project will not require additional government services.

h)The project design does not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

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

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

47. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare, or endangered plant or animal to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

48. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one that occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

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

15130)

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

The project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

c) 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:

GIS: Riverside County Geographic Information System database.

Southwest Area Plan, adopted October 2003.

MSHCP: Multi-Species habitat conservation Program, Adopted June 17, 2003.

RCIP: Riverside County Integrated Plan (General Plan), Adopted October 7, 2003.

PD-A 4208 Cultural Resource Assessment by Robert White dated June 28, 2006

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

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

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

Revised: 10/17/08