

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 41725
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): General Plan Amendment No. 912 and Plot Plan No. 23272
Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department
Address: P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409
Contact Person: Russell Brady, Project Planner
Telephone Number: (951) 955 - 1888
Applicant's Name: Prominent Properties, L.L.C.
Applicant's Address: 14082 Andy Place, Riverside, CA 92508

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description:

The General Plan Amendment proposes to amend the Riverside County General Plan Land Use Designation from Community Development: Highest Density Residential (CD:HHDR) (20 + Dwelling Units per Acre) to Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD:CR) (0.20 - 0.35 Floor Area Ratio).

The Plot Plan proposes the construction of a Community Shopping Center on a 0.36 gross acre lot (0.35 net acres). The proposal includes a 4,359 sq. ft. structure consisting of four (4) suites, 4,637 sq. ft. of landscaping (31%), and twenty (20) parking spaces including one (1) accessible parking space for persons with disabilities.

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

C. Total Project Area: 0.36 Gross Acres

Residential Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Units: N/A	Projected No. of Residents: N/A
Commercial Acres: 0.36	Lots: 1	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: 4,359	Est. No. of Employees: 12
Industrial Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: N/A	Est. No. of Employees: N/A
Other: N/A			

D. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 177-250-010

E. Street References: Northerly of Mission Boulevard and westerly of La Rue Street

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:
Section 16 RHO, Township 2 S, and Range 5 W

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The project site is relatively flat with some native shrubs that are evenly dispersed throughout the site. The project site is surrounded by residential developments to the north, east, south and west, and commercial developments to the south.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. **Land Use:** The proposed project meets the requirements of the proposed Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD:CR) (0.20 – 0.35 Floor Area Ratio) General Plan Land Use Designation. The proposed project meets all other applicable land use policies.
2. **Circulation:** Access to the proposed project is provided by Mission Boulevard to the south and by La Rue Street to the east; therefore, adequate circulation facilities exist, therefore no new facilities are being proposed. The project meets all other applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.
3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** No natural open space land was required to be preserved within the boundaries of the project. The project meets all other applicable Multipurpose Open Space element policies.
4. **Safety:** The proposed project is located under FEMA flood zone C. The proposed project is not located within any special hazard zone.
5. **Noise:** Sufficient mitigation against any foreseeable noise sources in the area has been provided for in the design of the project through perimeter walls and landscaping. The proposed project meets all other applicable noise element policies.
6. **Housing:** The proposed project does not include any housing; sufficient housing exists within the project site vicinity. The proposed project meets all other applicable housing element policies of the General Plan.
7. **Air Quality:** The proposed project has been conditioned to control any fugitive dust during grading and construction activities. The proposed project meets all other applicable policies.

B. General Plan Area Plan(s): Jurupa

C. Foundation Component(s): Community Development

D. Land Use Designation(s): Highest Density Residential (HHDR) (20+ Dwelling Units per Acre)

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

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

G. Adjacent and Surrounding:

- **Area Plan(s):** The proposal is surrounded by the Jurupa Area Plan to the north, east, south, and west.
- **Foundation Component(s):** The proposal is surrounded by the Community Development Foundation Component to the north, east, south, and west.
- **Land Use Designation(s):** The proposal is surrounded by the Highest Density Residential (HHDR) (20+ Dwelling Units per Acre) land use designation to the north and east, the Very High Density Residential (VHDR) (14 – 20 Dwelling Units per Acre) land use designation to the west, and the Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20 – 0.35 Floor Area Ratio) land use designation to the south.

- **Overlay(s) and Policy Area(s):** N/A

H. Adopted Specific Plan Information

- 1. Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** N/A
- 2. Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** N/A

I. Existing Zoning: General Commercial (C-1/C-P)

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: N/A

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: The proposal is surrounded by the General Commercial (C-1/C-P) zoning classification to the north, south, and west, and the Residential Incentive (R-6) zoning classification to the east

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input checked="" 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

12-12-08

Date

Russell Brady

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

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

Findings of Fact:

- A) The project site is not located within or near a scenic highway corridor; therefore it will not have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor. There will be no impact that will have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor.
- B) The project site has been previously disturbed and there are no scenic resources located on site; therefore, the proposed project will not disturb any scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features. There will be no impact that will substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

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

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 within the Mt. Palomar Observatory Area (approximately 54.63 miles away); therefore the proposed project will not interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are 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) The project will not create substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the project's vicinity and it will not expose residential property to unacceptable levels of light or glare. Development of the proposed project will result in the installation of on-site lighting. Although implementation of the proposed project will result in an incremental increase of lighting and glare, the proposed project will be in conformance with the lighting requirements addressed in County Ordinance 655. All lighting will be shielded and used to provide illumination for the security and safety of on-site areas such as parking, shipping and receiving, pathways and working areas.

B) The proposed project is located near residential developments, but has been conditioned so that any outside lighting shall be hooded and directed so as not to shine directly upon adjoining property or public rights-of-way (COA 10.PLANNING. 5). This condition of approval is standard and not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES Would the project

4. Agriculture

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

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

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

Findings of Fact:

- A) The project site is not located within the boundaries of land designated as prime, unique, or statewide important farmland (designated farmland). The Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP) designates the project site as Urban and Built-Up Land.
- B) No agricultural uses exist within the project site, and the RCIP indicates that the proposal is not under a Williamson Act Contract.
- C) The project site is not located within 300 feet of any existing agricultural uses; therefore, the proposed project will not cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property.
- D) The RCIP indicates that the proposal is not located on Farmland. Therefore, the proposal will not create impacts that will change the existing environment into a non-agricultural use.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

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

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 6-2

Findings of Fact:

A & B) The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is responsible for developing a regional air quality management plan to insure 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.

The 2003 AQMP is based on socioeconomic 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.

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. Blowing dust is also of concern in the dry desert areas where PM10 standards are exceeded by soil disturbance during grading, and vehicular travel over unpaved roads. These short-term construction related impacts will be reduced below a level of significance by dust control measures implemented during grading (COA 10.BS GRADE. 5). All projects are conditioned to control dust; therefore, this is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

C) As part of adoption of the County of Riverside's General Plan in 2003, the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH No. 2002051143) analyzed the General Plan growth projections for consistency with the AQMP and concluded that the General Plan is consistent with the 2003 AQMP. In addition, cumulative air quality impacts associated with the build-out of the County's General Plan was addressed on a regional basis by the County's General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR concluded that air quality is a significant and unavoidable impact of General Plan implementation. Thus, the proposed project would not result in cumulative air quality impacts beyond those previously discussed in the General Plan EIR

D) The project will not introduce sensitive receptors into the SCAB, which has non-attainment status for ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter (PM10). No sensitive receptors exist in the project vicinity. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result

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

in substantial local or regional air pollution impacts and, therefore, would not expose any nearby sensitive receptors to severe air pollution conditions. As such, exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be less than significant.

- E) The 2003 AQMP provides that the SCAQMD considers point sources to be generally large emitters or air pollution with one or more emission sources at a permitted facility with an identified location, such as power plants and refineries. These point source emitters or similar land uses do not occur within one mile of the site; therefore; no impact is anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- F) Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include the use of architectural coatings and solvents. SCAQMD Rule 1113 limits the amount of volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings and solvents. Via mandatory compliance with SCAQMD Rules, no construction activities or materials are proposed which would create objectionable odors. Similar uses are found generally to the north, east, and west are not considered uses that emit noxious or objectionable odors and would not include any of the types of uses identified by SCAQMD as being associated with odor complaints. Therefore, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people during construction or operation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project

6. Wildlife & Vegetation

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?

c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>Wildlife Service?</u>				
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: GIS database, WRCMSHCP, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

An Ecological Resource Specialist from the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department (EPD) has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that the proposal is in compliance with the Western Riverside County Multi Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRCMSHCP) requirements.

- A) The proposed project is located within a Western Riverside County Multi Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRCMSHCP); however, the proposed project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan.
- B) The proposed projects will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12).
- C) The proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service.
- D) The proposed project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- E&F) The proposed project is not located near any riparian or federally protected wetlands; therefore, the proposed project will not 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.
- G) The proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation since no trees or other biological resources exist on site that warrant preservation.

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.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

7. Historic Resources

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, and Archaeologist Review

Findings of Fact:

The Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California, Riverside has reviewed the project and conducted a records search for any known pre-historic, historic, and archaeological resources and has determined the following:

A & B) The records search conducted by the EIC failed to indicate the presence of any recorded prehistoric or historic resources within the boundaries of the project site. The project site has been previously disturbed, and the surrounding areas are fully developed. It is anticipated that the proposed project would not cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California code of regulations, section 15064.5.

All projects in the County are conditioned to stop all ground disturbances if an inadvertent archeological find occurs, to insure accuracy of any findings, (COA 10.PLANNING.1 & COA 10.PLANNING. 2). These are standard conditions of approval and are not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

8. Archaeological Resources

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

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

The Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California, Riverside has reviewed the project and conducted a records search for any known pre-historic, historic, and archaeological resources and has determined the following:

A & B) The records search conducted by the EIC failed to indicate the presence of any recorded archaeological resources within the boundaries of the project site. The project site has been previously disturbed, and the surrounding areas are fully developed. It is anticipated that the proposed project would not cause substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in California code of regulations, section 15064.5.

C & D) The proposed project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries and it will not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area, since these uses are non-existent at the project site.

All projects in the County are conditioned to stop all ground disturbances if any human remains or unique cultural resources are encountered during grading (COA10.PLANNING. 1 & COA 10.PLANNING. 2). These are standard conditions of approval and are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

9. Paleontological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"

Findings of Fact:

A) Per RCIP, the project site is located within an area of low paleontological sensitivity; additionally, review and comment from the County Archaeologist concluded that the proposal will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature, therefore no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project				
10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, Geologist Comments, Riverside County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 1993, prepared by Mammoth Soils Laboratories, Inc., dated December 21, 2007

Findings of Fact:

- A) The Geo report submitted for the proposed project determined that the site does not lie within a State of California or County of Riverside established earthquake fault zone and a review of available aerial photos and site mapping did not reveal any indication of active faults either crossing or trending toward the subject site (COA 10.PLANNING. 43). Therefore the potential for this site to be affected by surface fault rupture is considered low; as such, the proposed project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including injury or death.
- B) The proposed project will not be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault. The project site is located 6 miles from the nearest active fault line; therefore, no mitigation is required.

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction", Riverside County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 1993, prepared by Mammoth Soils Laboratories, Inc., dated December 21, 2007

Findings of Fact:

- A) Per the RCIP, the project site is located within an area of moderate Liquefaction potential. The Geo report concluded that there is a potential for liquefaction at the site, however no evidence of geologic hazards such as faults, slippage, or surface rupture was noted which may affect the proposed improvement or adjacent properties (COA 10.PLANNING. 43). Therefore, impacts are 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
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

12. Ground-shaking Zone Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), Riverside County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 1993, prepared by Mammoth Soils Laboratories, Inc., dated December 21, 2007

Findings of Fact:

A) Per the RCIP, the project site is not located within an area subject to seismic ground shaking; therefore, no mitigation measures are required. The Geo report concluded that the potential for surface fault rupture at the site is negligible, based upon research, review of aerial photos and geologic mapping of the site (COA 10.PLANNING. 43). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

13. Landslide Risk a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: On-site Inspection, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope", Riverside County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 1993, prepared by Mammoth Soils Laboratories, Inc., dated December 21, 2007

Findings of Fact:

A) The proposed project is not located in areas where there are unstable soils that may cause landslides. The topography on the site is relatively flat. No manufactured slopes will exceed 30 feet; therefore, there will be no impacts that will create landslides.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

14. Ground Subsidence a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Resolution No. 94-125, Riverside County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 1993, prepared by Mammoth Soils Laboratories, Inc., dated December 21, 2007

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

Findings of Fact:

A) Per RCIP and Geo report, there is a potential for subsidence at the site, however, it occurs at a depth that will not affect the proposed structures (COA 10.PLANNING. 43). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

15. Other Geologic Hazards

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

A) Per the review conducted by the County Geologist and the Geo report, the project site is not located within an area subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard (CO 10.PLANNING. 43). Therefore, there will be no impact as a result of the project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

16. Slopes

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

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

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

Source: Riv. Co. 800 Scale Slope Maps, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

A) The proposed project will not substantially change the topography of the project site. The project site is already graded and will require a minimal amount of grading for construction of buildings and for additional paving of the site. Impacts associated with these changes to the topography are anticipated to have a less than significant impact.

B) The proposed project does not propose cut or fill slopes that would exceed 2:1; Therefore, there will be no impact.

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

C) Sewer will be provided by the Jurupa Community Services District; Therefore, there will be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

17. Soils

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

b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Source: U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

A) Per RCIP, the proposed project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

B) The project site is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

18. Erosion

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

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

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

Findings of Fact:

A) The proposed project will not have an impact on the channels of any river, stream or lake bed as a result of any changes from deposition, siltation or erosion.

B) The project will not result in any increase in water erosion either on-site or off-site. The proposed project has been conditioned to comply with the California Building Code and Riverside County Ordinance No. 457, NPDES and SWPPP to reduce the affect the project may have to less than significant. (COA 60.BS GRADE. 4 and COA 60.BS GRADE. 9). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated.

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

Mitigation: The proposed project has been conditioned to comply with the California Building Code and Riverside County Ordinance No. 457, NPDES and SWPPP to reduce the affect the project may have to less than significant. (COA 60.BS GRADE. 4 and COA 60.BS GRADE. 9).

Monitoring: Monitoring of mitigation measures shall be conducted by the Building and Safety Department.

19. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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) Per RCIP, the project site is not located within an area subject to wind erosion and blow-sand. Therefore, there will be no impact as a result of the project.

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

Source: Project Application Materials

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

Findings of Fact:

- A-C) During construction of the proposed development, there is a limited potential for accidental release of construction-related products although not in sufficient quantity to pose a significant hazard to people and the environment. The end-users may use potentially hazardous materials, such as fuel, paint products, lubricants, solvents, and cleaning products, which may be used during the course of daily activities. The proposed project may transport and use potentially hazardous materials during construction and operation; however, by complying with the mitigation measures listed below any foreseeable impacts will be mitigated to less than significant.
- D) There is no existing or proposed school within a quarter mile of the proposed project; therefore, the proposed 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. The areas adjacent to the proposed project site have been previously developed and operate similar and compatible uses. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.
- E) According to the RCIP, no sources of health hazards are known to exist on the project site or in the vicinity. In addition, the project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site therefore, no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned to provide a business emergency plan for the storage of hazardous materials, and if further review of the site indicates environmental health issues, the Hazardous Materials Management Division reserves the right to regulate the business in accordance with applicable County ordinances (COA 90.E HEALTH. 1, COA 90.E HEALTH. 2, & COA 90.E HEALTH. 3).

Monitoring: Monitoring of mitigation measures shall be conducted by the Department of Building & Safety and the Environmental Health Department.

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 Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review

Findings of Fact:

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

- A) The project is not located within an Airport Master Plan; therefore, there will be no inconsistency with an existing Airport Master Plan.
- B) The project is located within the Flabob Airport Influence Area (Zone E) and as such will require review by the Airport Land Use Commission. ALUC has determined that the project will not adversely affect the Flabob Airport since its design does not violate any policies or regulations of the Flabob Airport Master Plan. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
- C) The project is located within the Flabob Airport Influence Area (Zone E). ALUC has determined that the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area since its design does not violate any policies or regulations of the Flabob Airport Master Plan. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
- D) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport; therefore, there will be no impact as a result of project implementation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

22. Hazardous Fire Area

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

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

Findings of Fact:

- A) Per the RCIP, the proposed project is not located within a high fire area and will not require fuel modifications along the pad area; as such, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project

23. Water Quality Impacts

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

b) Violate any water quality standards or waste

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
discharge requirements?				
c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors and odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

- A) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site ore area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The site is protected by the freeway collector channel minor sheet flow type runoff impacts the site from the north. The site currently sheet flows towards the southwest to the existing District's Rubidoux Channel stage 2. Since the development has an adequate outlet, mitigation for increased runoff due to development is not required but mitigation for water quality impacts is required. The WQMP proposes water quality swales along the southern and northern property line as a treatment control BMP. In addition to the swales, the developer is also proposing porous pavement for the northern parking stalls. In concept, these treatment control features would adequately mitigate the impacts to water quality the development of this site would cause. However, in final plan check stage, the developer may need some adjustments as the swale shown on the northern side has 4:1 slope on the curb side while the District standard calls for 4:1 slope along the parking lot (COA 90.FLOOD RI. 3). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated.
- B) The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements since the development has an adequate outlet, mitigation for increased runoff due to development is not required but mitigation for water quality impacts is required (COA 90.FLOOD RI. 3). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated.

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

- C) The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted) since project specific BMPs are being proposed that shall mitigate such impacts (COA 90.FLOOD RI. 3). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated.
- D) The project will not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The WQMP proposes water quality swales along the southern and northern property line as a treatment control BMP. In addition to the swales, the developer is also proposing porous pavement for the northern parking stalls. In concept, these treatment control features would adequately mitigate the impacts to water quality the development of this site would cause. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated (COA 90.FLOOD RI. 3).
- E) 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, since the project is not located within such an area.
- F) The project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flows since it is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.
- G) The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality since it has been conditioned to provide BMPs that will mitigate said impacts (COA 90.FLOOD RI. 3).
- H) Although the project will include new BMPs, they will not result in significant environmental effects. Said BMPs are acceptable to the Riverside County Flood Control District and as such, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated (COA 90.FLOOD RI. 3).

Mitigation: All structural BMPs described in the project-specific WQMP shall be constructed and installed in conformance with approved plans and specifications (COA 90.FLOOD RI. 3)

Monitoring: Monitoring of the mitigation measures shall be conducted by the Riverside County Flood Control District.

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?

b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
of surface runoff?				
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) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including 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. Since the development has an adequate outlet, mitigation for increased runoff due to development is not required but mitigation for water quality impacts is required (COA 90.FLOOD RI. 3).
- B) The project will not change the absorption rate or the rate and amount of surface runoff due to proposed structural BMPs that will address those impacts (COA 90.FLOOD RI. 3). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated.
- C) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam since it is not located in an area where flooding exists.
- D) The project will not change the amount of surface water in any water body since it is not located near a water body.

Mitigation: All structural BMPs described in the project-specific WQMP shall be constructed and installed in conformance with approved plans and specifications (COA 90.FLOOD RI. 3)

Monitoring: Monitoring of the mitigation measures shall be conducted by the Riverside County Flood Control District.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project				
25. Land Use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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:

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

- A) The project will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area. The project will continue the present and future logical development of the area. The commercial retail center will provide necessary services for the area. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
- B) The project is not located within a city sphere of influence. Therefore, the project will not affect the land use within a city sphere of influence within an adjacent city or county.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

26. Planning	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

- A) The project is consistent with the existing General Commercial (C-1/C-P) zoning classification since it is proposing a commercial retail shopping center. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
- B) The project is consistent with the General Commercial (C-1/C-P) zoning classification that surrounds it to the north, west, and south. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
- C) The project is compatible with the existing and planned surrounding land uses. The project is surrounded by commercial developments to the west and south. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
- D) The project is consistent with the Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD:CR) (0.20 – 0.35 Floor Area Ratio) land use designation. The proposal is consistent with the adopted policies of the Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20 – 0.35 Floor Area Ratio) land use designation and other applicable adopted RCIP policies. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

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

E) The project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangements of an established community including a low-income or minority community. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

27. Mineral Resources

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

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

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

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

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

Findings of Fact:

A & C) Per the RCIP, no mineral resources have been identified on the project site and there is no historical use of the site or surrounding area for mineral extraction purposes. No impacts are anticipated as a result of the implementation of the proposed project.

B & D) The proposed project will not result in the loss of locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. Furthermore, the proposed project will not expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines.

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

28. Airport Noise

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

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

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

NA A B C D

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

NA A B C D

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map, Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review

Findings of Fact:

- A) The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan but is located within the Flabob Airport Influence Area – Zone E. ALUC has reviewed the project and has determined that it is consistent with all applicable policies of the Flabob Airport Influence Area – Zone E since the use and its design will only create less than significant impacts for the zone.
- B) The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or heliport. Although the project is located within the Flabob Airport influence Area – Zone E, ALUC has reviewed the project and has determined that it is not anticipated that the project will expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

29. Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

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

Findings of Fact:

- A) The proposed project is not proposing a railroad and therefore will not cause railroad noise, nor will it be impacts by an existing or proposed railroad. No impact is anticipated.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

30. Highway Noise

NA A B C D

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

- A) The project is not proposing a highway and is not located in an area near a highway. Therefore, the project will not result in highway noise.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

31. Other Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

- A) The project will not result in other noise since it is proposing a use that is similar to those to the south of the project site. Although residences surround the project to the north and west, the proposed 6' CMU wall that surround the project site along those areas shall be sufficient to mitigate any ambient noise created by the commercial shopping center.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

32. Noise Effects on or by the Project

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

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?

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

- A) The proposed project will increase the ambient noise levels of the area throughout project build-out, but such increase will cease after project build-out. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.
- B) The proposed project will create unavoidable incremental ambient noise in the project vicinity through construction activities; however, the increase in ambient noise levels will be less than significant because the project site boundaries are developed and similar uses operate with similar noise levels.
- C & D) Persons might be exposed to groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction of the project; however, to minimize ambient noise levels during construction of the proposed project, grading and construction shall be restricted to daylight hours. Construction equipment shall be maintained in good working order and cannot be serviced or repaired on site.

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

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

Findings of Fact:

A,B)The proposal will not displace any existing housing since the project site is existing. The proposed project will contribute to an increase of population growth in the area and the demand for housing by adding new business and creating new jobs. However, the proposed project's impact will be insignificant with the total growth of the area.

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

- C) The proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- D) The proposed project is located within the Rubidoux Redevelopment Area. The proposal has been reviewed by the Riverside County Economic Development Agency and has concluded that the proposal is consistent with the adopted policies of the Redevelopment Area. Per the Economic Development Agency, the proposal is a “value-added” development that meets all applicable criteria of the Rubidoux Redevelopment Area. Therefore, impacts that will affect a County Redevelopment Project Area are considered to be less than significant.
- E & F) The proposed project will cumulatively add population growth to the area; however, the proposed project’s impact will be insignificant with the total growth of the area and therefore will not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

34. Fire Services

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact:

- A) The proposed project will incrementally increase the demand for fire services within Riverside County. However, the project will not require the provision of new or altered government facilities at this time; therefore, the project would not create substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities because they are not needed at this time.

This project has been conditioned for the payment of standard mitigation fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 659 (COA 90.PLANNING. 29). Any project subject to Ordinance 659 will be conditioned for compliance. As no unique mitigation measures are identified, no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

35. Sheriff Services

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

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

- A) The proposed project will incrementally increase the demand for Sheriff's services within Riverside County. However, the project will not require the provision of new or altered government facilities at this time; therefore, the project would not create substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities because they are not needed at this time.

This project has been conditioned for the payment of standard mitigation fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 659 (COA 90.PLANNING. 29). Any project subject to Ordinance 659 will be conditioned for compliance. As no unique mitigation measures are identified, no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

36. Schools

Source: Jurupa Unified School District correspondence, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

- A) The proposed project is located within the Jurupa Unified School District. The project will not require the provision of new or altered government facilities at this time.

The project is conditioned for the payment of standard school impact fees in accordance with the state law. Any project subject to state law will be conditioned for compliance. As no unique mitigation measures are identified, no additional mitigation measures are required (COA 80.PLANNING.18).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

37. Libraries

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

- A) The proposed project will not create a significant incremental demand for library services. The project will not require the provision of new or altered government facilities at this time; therefore, the project would not create substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities because they are not needed at

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

this time. This increase is less than significant as the project will pay standard fees (COA 90.PLANNING. 29).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

38. Health Services

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

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

- A) The proposed project will not require the provision of new or altered facilities at this time since adequate facilities exist within the project's vicinity.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are 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?

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

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

Findings of Fact:

- A) The proposed project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a recreational facility; therefore, no trail improvements or expansions will be required for this project.

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

- B) The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a neighborhood or community park; therefore, the proposed project will not include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.
- C) The proposed development is located within Jurupa Area Recreation & Parks District, which is responsible for the collection of Quimby fees; however, the proposed project is a commercial project which is exempt from such fees.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

40. Recreational Trails

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

Findings of Fact:

- A) Per the RCIP, the project is not located within or near a recreational trail.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41. Circulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's	<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
construction?				
i) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP, Transportation Department Review

Findings of Fact:

- A & C) The Transportation Department has not required a traffic study for the proposed project; therefore, the proposed project will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system nor exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways.
- B) The project is proposing 20 parking stalls, which is a number that is consistent with the requirement of Riverside County Ordinance No. 348. Therefore, the project will not result in inadequate parking capacity. No mitigation measures are required.
- D & E) The proposed project does not include any services or demands for air, rail, or waterborne traffic; therefore, the proposed project will not 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 or Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic.
- F) The project will not substantially increase hazards to a design feature or incompatible uses since the design is acceptable to the Transportation Department. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
- G) The project will case a need for altered roads. Mission Boulevard along project boundary is a paved County maintained road designated as an Arterial Highway and shall be improved with 8" concrete curb and gutter located 49 feet from existing centerline to curb line, 8" curbed edge of pavement landscaped median, and match up asphalt concrete paving; reconstruction; or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by the Transportation Department within the 60 foot half-width dedicated right-of-way in accordance with County Standard No. 92. (49'/60') (Modified for improvements and reduced right-of-way from 64' to 60'.) NOTE: A 5' sidewalk shall be constructed adjacent to curb line within the 11' parkway (COA 90.TRANS. 5 and COA 90.TRANS. 9). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated.
- H) The proposed project will temporarily increase traffic during construction; however, due to the size of the project site, such traffic shall be less than significant.
- I) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses since the design is acceptable to the Riverside County Transportation and Fire Department. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
- J) The project will not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (E.G. bus turnouts, bicycle racks) since it is proposing a commercial retail development that encourages bicycle use and walking. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

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

Mitigation: Mission Boulevard along project boundary is a paved County maintained road designated as an Arterial Highway and shall be improved with 8" concrete curb and gutter located 49 feet from existing centerline to curb line, 8" curbed edge of pavement landscaped median, and match up asphalt concrete paving; reconstruction; or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by the Transportation Department within the 60 foot half-width dedicated right-of-way in accordance with County Standard No. 92. (49'/60') (Modified for improvements and reduced right-of-way from 64' to 60'.) NOTE: A 5' sidewalk shall be constructed adjacent to curb line within the 11' parkway (COA 90.TRANS. 5 and COA 90.TRANS. 9).

Monitoring: Monitoring of the mitigation measures shall be conducted by the Riverside County Transportation Department and the Building and Safety Department.

42. Bike Trails

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

- A) Per the RCIP, the project site is not located along an existing or proposed bike trail; therefore, the proposed project will not impact any bike trails.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

43. Water

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

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

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

- A) The proposed project will not require the construction of new water treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities because such facilities are available in the area. The surrounding area is currently developed and is composed of Industrial uses; all infrastructures to the area have been upgraded previously.

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

B) The proposed project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project; the project site is located within the area of service for the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD).

All projects are required to submit a "Will Serve" letter from the appropriate water purveyor for the area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

44. Sewer

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

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

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

A) The proposed project will not require the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems or expansion of existing facilities because such facilities are available in the area. The surrounding area is currently developed and is composed of Industrial uses; all infrastructures to the area have been upgraded previously.

B) The proposed project will not exceed the capacity of the sewer system as proposed. The project site is located within the area of service for the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD).

All projects are required to submit a "Will Serve" letter from the appropriate sewer purveyor for the area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

45. Solid Waste

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

b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and

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

regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan))?

Source: RCIP, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence

Findings of Fact:

A & B) The project will not substantially alter existing or future solid waste generation patterns and disposal services. The project will be consistent with the County Integrated Waste Management Plan and all other applicable federal, state, and local regulations. The solid waste produced by this development will be sent to the El Sobrante Land Fill.

The project has been conditioned to comply with the requirements of the Riverside County Waste Management District (COA 80.PLANNING.16). This is not considered a unique condition of approval pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

46. Utilities

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

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

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

A - H) The project will not require or result in the construction of new community utilities or the expansion of existing community utility facilities. Implementation of the project will result in an incremental system capacity demand for energy systems, communication systems, storm water drainage systems, street lighting systems, maintenance of public facilities, including roads and potentially other governmental services. These impacts are considered less than significant based on the availability of existing public facilities (such as drainage facilities and wastewater collection and treatment systems (Rubidoux Community Services District) that support local systems. The applicant or applicant-in-successor shall make arrangements with each utility provider to ensure each building is connected to the appropriate utilities. The

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

project is not anticipated to be in conflict or create any significant impacts associated with the adopted energy conservation plans.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

47. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare, or endangered plant or animal, or 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 impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of other current projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

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

49. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review, project application

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

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

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

- RCIP: Riverside County Integrated Project
- GIS Database
- Riverside County Conditions of Approval
- Jurupa Area Plan
- Riverside County Ordinance No. 348
- Riverside County Ordinance No. 659
- Riverside County Ordinance No. 655
- Riverside County Ordinance No. 457
- Jurupa Unified School District correspondence
- Project Application Materials
- Waste Management District Correspondence
- Riverside County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 1993, prepared by Mammoth Soils Laboratories, Inc., dated December 21, 2007

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

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

RB:bc

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\PP23272\PC Hearing\PP23272-EA41725-(12-11-08).doc