

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 41937

Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Change of Zone No. 7654 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 35896

Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department

Address: 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409

Contact Person: Christian Hinojosa, Project Planner

Telephone Number: (951) 955-0972

Applicant's Name: Christian & Deanna Lazoore

Applicant's Address: 6046 Pedley Road; Riverside, CA 92509

Engineer's Name: Landmark Surveys

Engineer's Address: 14586 Choke Cherry Drive; Victorville, CA 92392

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description:

Change of Zone No. 7654 proposes to change the project site's existing zoning classification from Light Agriculture - 1 Acre Minimum (A-1-1) to Light Agriculture (A-1).

Tentative Parcel Map No. 35896 is a Schedule 'G' subdivision of 2.97 gross (2.36 net) acres into four (4) residential parcels with a minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet.

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

C. Total Project Area: 2.97 Gross / 2.36 Net Acres

Residential Acres: 2.97	Lots: 4	Units: N/A	Projected No. of Residents: N/A
Commercial Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: N/A	Est. No. of Employees: N/A
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: 165-190-001

E. Street References: southerly of 60th Street and easterly of Pedley Road

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:
Section 23, Township 2 South, Range 6 West

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The project site is located in the Jurupa Area Plan of the Riverside County General Plan. Urban development and/or urban entitlements have been approved or are currently being processed through the County of Riverside to the north, south and east. Vacant land, residential, and commercial areas currently surround the project site. The project site is mostly vacant with low-growing vegetation. Currently there is an existing 3,663 square foot single family residence and a 1,485 square foot attached garage both to remain in proposed Parcel 4. The topography of the project site is generally level, with a low elevation of approximately 740 feet above mean sea level over the majority of the property.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. **Land Use:** The proposed subdivision meets the requirements of the Community Development: Low Density Residential (CD: LDR) (1/2 Acre Minimum) General Plan Land Use Designation. The proposed subdivision meets all other applicable land use policies, including the Equestrian Sphere Policy.
2. **Circulation:** The proposed subdivision has been reviewed for conformance with County Ordinance 461 by the Riverside County Transportation Department. Adequate circulation facilities exist and are proposed to serve the proposed subdivision. The proposed subdivision meets with all applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.
3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** A ten to fourteen foot (10'-14') wide trail runs along Pedley Road and the Project Applicant has been conditioned to submit a trails plan to the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District for review and approval. No natural open space land was required to be preserved within the boundaries of this subdivision. The proposed subdivision meets with all other applicable Multipurpose Open Space Element policies.
4. **Safety:** The proposed subdivision is within an area that has a low subsidence and hydroconsolidation potential. The proposed subdivision is not located within any other special hazard zone (including fault zone, high fire hazard area, dam inundation zone, etc.). The proposed subdivision meets with all other applicable Safety Element policies.
5. **Noise:** Sufficient mitigation against any foreseeable noise impacts have been incorporated into the design of the subdivision. The proposed subdivision meets all other applicable Noise element policies.
6. **Housing:** The subdivision proposes to subdivide 2.97 gross (2.36 net) acres into four (4) residential parcels with proposed Light Agriculture (A-1) zoning. The proposed subdivision could potentially induce population growth in the area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure). There is a less than significant impact to housing as a direct result of this subdivision.
7. **Air Quality:** The proposed subdivision has been conditioned to control any fugitive dust during grading and construction activities. The proposed subdivision meets all other applicable Air Quality Element policies.

A. General Plan Area Plan(s): Jurupa Area Plan

B. Foundation Component(s): Community Development

C. Land Use Designation(s): Low Density Residential (LDR) (1/2 Acre Minimum)

D. Overlay(s), if any: Jurupa Valley Redevelopment Project Area (JVPA) (Pedley sub-area)

E. Policy Area(s), if any: Equestrian Sphere Policy Area

F. Adjacent and Surrounding:

1. **Area Plan(s):** Jurupa Area Plan

2. Foundation Component(s):

To the North: Rural Community
To the South: Community Development
To the East: Community Development
To the West: Community Development

3. Land Use Designation(s):

To the North: Low Density Residential
To the South: Low Density Residential
To the East: Low Density Residential
To the West: Public Facilities

4. Overlay(s):

To the North: Jurupa Valley Redevelopment Project Area (JVPA) (Pedley sub-area) and Equestrian Sphere Policy Area
To the South: Jurupa Valley Redevelopment Project Area (JVPA) (Pedley sub-area) and Equestrian Sphere Policy Area
To the East: Jurupa Valley Redevelopment Project Area (JVPA) (Pedley sub-area) and Equestrian Sphere Policy Area
To the West: Jurupa Valley Redevelopment Project Area (JVPA) (Pedley sub-area) and Equestrian Sphere Policy Area

G. 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

H. Existing Zoning: Light Agriculture - 1 Acre Minimum (A-1-1)

I. Proposed Zoning, if any: Light Agriculture (A-1)

J. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning:

To the North: Light Agriculture - 1 Acre Minimum (A-1-1)
To the South: Light Agriculture - 1 Acre Minimum (A-1-1)
To the East: Light Agriculture - 1 Acre Minimum (A-1-1)
To the West: General Commercial (C-1/CP)

II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

III. 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

Date January 5, 2010

Christina Hinojosa, Project Planner
Printed Name

For Ron Goldman, Planning Director

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed subdivision is to subdivide 2.97 gross (2.36 net) acres into four (4) residential parcels. The project site is located in a primarily urban area of Riverside County, which has no designated Scenic Highways. The Riverside County Integrated Plan (RCIP) indicates that the project site is not located within a designated scenic corridor. Development of the project site will not affect any scenic resources, as adjacent lands have been developed with uses compatible with the proposed subdivision.

b) The proposed subdivision will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features, or obstruct a prominent scenic vista or view open to the public, as these features do not exist on the project site. Additionally, the proposed subdivision will not 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 ?				

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the GIS Database, the project site is located approximately 55.36 miles from the Mt. Palomar Observatory. The subdivision is located outside the 45-mile radius defined by Ordinance No. 655 and the 30-mile radius defined by the RCIP as the Mt. Palomar Special Lighting Areas, and, therefore, is not subject to any special lighting policies that protect 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 (2008), Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed subdivision will result in a new source of light and glare from the addition of security lighting as well as vehicular lighting from cars traveling on adjacent roadways.

b) The proposed subdivision is not expected to create unacceptable light levels. Therefore, the proposed subdivision would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or expose residential property to unacceptable light levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract (Riv. Co. Agricultural Land Conservation Contract Maps)?

c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within

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

300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?

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 will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.

b) The project site will not conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract (Riv. Co. Agricultural Land Conservation Contract Maps).

c) The project is located wholly within 300 feet of existing agriculturally zoned properties. Lot Numbers 1 - 4, as known on this map, are located partly or wholly within 300-feet of, land zoned for primarily agricultural purposes by the County of Riverside. It is the declared policy of the County of Riverside that no agricultural activity, operation, or facility, or appurtenance thereof, conducted or maintained for commercial purposes in the unincorporated area of the County, and in a manner consistent with proper and accepted customs and standards, as established and followed by similar agricultural operations in the same locality, shall be or become a nuisance, private or public, due to any changed condition, in or about the locality, after the same has been in operation for more than three (3) years, if it wasn't a nuisance at the time it began. The term "agricultural activity", operation or facility, or appurtenances thereof "includes, but is not limited to, the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the production, cultivation, growing and harvesting of any apiculture, or horticulture, the raising of livestock, fur bearing animals, fish or poultry, and any practices performed by a farmer or on a farm as incident to, or in conjunction with, such farming operations, including preparation for market, delivery to storage, or to market, or to carriers for transportation to market."

In the event the number of lots, or the configuration of lots, of the FINAL MAP differs from that shown on the approved TENTATIVE MAP, the actual language used above shall reflect those lots which are partly or wholly within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned (A-1, A-2, A-P, A-D) properties (COA: 50.PLANNING.16).

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project

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				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
applicable air quality plan?				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook (1993); AQMD Air Quality Management Plan (2007); County General Plan Air Quality Element; Project Application Materials; Project Trip Generation Analysis

Findings of Fact:

a) 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 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.

b) The SCAQMD permit is evidence that the point source complies with all SCAQMD rules and regulations. Air quality impacts would occur during site preparation, including grading and equipment exhaust. Major sources of fugitive dust are a result of grading and site preparation during construction by vehicles and equipment and generated by construction vehicles and equipment traveling over exposed surfaces, as well as by soil disturbances from grading and filling. These short-term construction related impacts will be reduced below a level of significance by dust control measures implemented during grading. (COA: 10.BS GRADE.5) This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

c) The subdivision will not 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.

d) A sensitive receptor is a person in the population who is particularly susceptible to health effects due to exposure to an air contaminant than is the population at large. Sensitive receptors (and the facilities that house them) in proximity to localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants or odors are of particular concern. High levels of CO are associated with major traffic sources, such as freeways and major intersections, and toxic air contaminants are normally associated with manufacturing and

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

commercial operations. Land uses considered to be sensitive receptors include long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. Surrounding land uses include residences to the north and south of the project site, which is considered a sensitive receptor; however, the project is not expected to generate substantial point source emissions. The long-term project impacts in the daily allowable emissions for the project's operational phase are considered to be not significant.

e) The subdivision will not create sensitive receptors located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project

6. Wildlife & Vegetation

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

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 Wildlife Service?

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?

g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation

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

policy or ordinance?

Source: GIS database, WRMSHCP, On-site Inspection 7/17/08

Findings of Fact:

- a) Based on the MSHCP the subdivision may conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan. Therefore, this subdivision will have a less than significant impact with mitigation.
- b) No state or federally listed Threatened or Endangered species are expected to occur nor would the implementation of the proposed project result in take of any state or federally listed Threatened or Endangered species. Thus, the subdivision 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.
- c) During the field survey, no burrowing owls or suitable nesting opportunities were observed onsite; however, the subdivision may have a substantial adverse effect on endangered or threatened species. In order to mitigate the potential impacts, a pre-construction survey is required. Therefore, this subdivision will have a less than significant impact with mitigation.
- d) The subdivision 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) The proposed subdivision 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.
- f) The proposed subdivision will not 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.
- g) The proposed subdivision will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Mitigation: Pursuant to Objective 6 and Objective 7 of the Species Account for the Burrowing Owl included in the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, within 30 days prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a pre-construction presence/absence survey for the burrowing owl shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and the results of this presence/absence survey shall be provided in writing to the Environmental Programs Department. If it is determined that the project site is occupied by the Burrowing Owl, take of "active" nests shall be avoided pursuant to the MSHCP and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. However, when the Burrowing Owl is present, relocation outside of the nesting season (March 1 through August 31) by a qualified biologist shall be required. The County Biologist shall be consulted to determine appropriate type of relocation (active or passive) and translocation sites. Occupation of this species on the project site may result in the need to revise grading plans so that take of "active" nests is avoided or alternatively, a grading permit may be issued once the species has been actively relocated. If the grading permit is not obtained within 30 days of the survey a new survey shall be required. (COA: 60.EPD.1)

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

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Building and Safety and Environmental Programs Departments through the permitting process.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. Historic Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-7, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) A records search conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) indicated that no historical resources existed on the project site. Therefore the proposed subdivision will not alter or destroy an historic site.

b) Development of the proposed subdivision will have a less than significant impact on a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5.

If during ground disturbance activities, unique cultural resources are discovered that were not assessed by the environmental assessment conducted prior to project approval, the following procedures shall be followed. Unique cultural resources are defined, for this condition, as being multiple artifacts in close association with each other, but may include fewer artifacts if the area of the find is determined to be of significance due to its sacred or cultural importance.

1. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the archaeologist, the Native American tribal representative and the Planning Director to discuss the significance of the find.

2. At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed and after consultation with the Native American tribal representative and the archaeologist, a decision shall be made, with the concurrence of the Planning Director, as to the appropriate mitigation. Conditions of Approval 10.PLANNING.04 and 10.PLANNING.05 are not considered unique mitigation measures pursuant to CEQA. No additional mitigation is identified or required.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

potential impact area?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-6 “Relative Archaeological Sensitivity of Diverse Landscapes, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

- a) This area has been completely disturbed. It is not identified as an area of Relative Archaeological Sensitivity of Diverse Landscapes map of the RCIP, Multipurpose Open Space Element (Figure OS-06). Therefore, this subdivision will have no impact on archaeological resources.
- b) This subdivision will have a less than significant impact change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5.
- c) This subdivision will have less than significant impact on human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. However, as a precaution, this project has been conditioned to halt construction and immediately contact the State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 if human remains are found. If remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify the appropriate Native American Tribe who is the most likely descendant. The descendant shall inspect the site of discovery and make a recommendation as to the appropriate mitigation. After the recommendation has been made, the property owner, Native American Tribe representative, and a County representative shall meet to determine the appropriate mitigation measures and corrective actions to be implemented. Condition of Approval 10.PLANNING.04 is not considered a unique mitigation measure pursuant to CEQA. No additional mitigation is identified or required.
- d) This subdivision will not restrict existing or religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

9. Paleontological Resources

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 “Paleontological Sensitivity”

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the Riverside County General Plan, the project site is located within an area of High Paleontological sensitivity (High A). Therefore, this subdivision will have a less than significant impact with mitigation on potential paleontological resources.

Mitigation: Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits, the applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist approved by the County of Riverside to create and implement a project-specific plan for monitoring site grading/earthmoving activities (project paleontologist). The project paleontologist retained shall

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

review the approved development plan and grading plan and shall conduct any pre-construction work necessary to render appropriate monitoring and mitigation requirements as appropriate. These requirements shall be documented by the project paleontologist in a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP). This PRIMP shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to issuance of a Grading Permit. (COA: 60.PLANNING.01). Prior to Final Inspection, the applicant shall submit to the County Geologist one wet-signed copy of the Paleontological Monitoring Report prepared for site grading operations at this site. The report shall be certified by the professionally-qualified Paleontologist responsible for the content of the report. This Paleontologist must be on the County's Paleontology Consultant List. (COA: 90.PLANNING.01).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by Building and Safety through the permitting process.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 2162 prepared by Soil Exploration Company, Inc., dated May 5, 2009

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The proposed subdivision will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death. California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to residential development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all commercial development they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

b) The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and no known fault lines are present on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, there is a low potential for rupture of a known fault.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction", County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 2162 prepared by Soil Exploration Company, Inc., dated May 5, 2009

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located within an area of high liquefaction potential. The County Geologist has reviewed and approved the project with no conditions of approval.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

12. Ground-shaking Zone

Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 2162 prepared by Soil Exploration Company, Inc., dated May 5, 2009

Findings of Fact:

a) There are no known active or potentially active faults that traverse the site and the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The principal seismic hazard that could affect the site is ground shaking resulting from an earthquake occurring along several major active or potentially active faults in southern California. The County Department of Building and Safety requires construction to conform to the California Building Code (CBC). Through the compliance with Riverside County requirements related to geotechnical and soil reports, the potential of the proposed subdivision due to ground shaking will be 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?

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is generally flat and according to Figure S-5, the project site is not located in an area with slopes greater than 25%; therefore, there is no potential for landslides. The project site and surrounding area does not consist of rocky terrain therefore the project is not subject to rock fall hazards. No impacts will occur as a result of the proposed project.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

14. Ground Subsidence

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

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

Source: RCIP Figure S-7 "Documented Subsidence Areas", County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 2162 prepared by Soil Exploration Company, Inc., dated May 5, 2009

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located in an area susceptible to subsidence but not located near any documented areas of subsidence. California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

15. Other Geologic Hazards

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

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

Source: Project Application Materials, County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 2162 prepared by Soil Exploration Company, Inc., dated May 5, 2009

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located in an area susceptible to unstable geologic hazards such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard on the project site.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

16. Slopes

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

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

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

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

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

c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface

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

sewage disposal systems?

Source: RCIP figure S-5 “Regions Underlain by Steep Slopes”, Building and Safety – Grading Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

- a) The subdivision will not significantly change the existing topography on the subject site. The grading will follow the natural slopes and not alter any significant elevated topographic features located on the site.
- b) The subdivision will not cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1, but may create a slope higher than 10 feet. In order to minimize the impact, the project has been conditioned to grade so that the slopes reflect the natural terrain.
- c) The subdivision will not result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: RCIP figure S-6 “Engineering Geologic Materials Map”, Flood Control review, Building and Safety Grading review, Project Application Materials, County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 2162 prepared by Soil Exploration Company, Inc., dated May 5, 2009

Findings of Fact:

- a) The development of the project site may have the potential to result in soil erosion during grading and construction. Standard Conditions of Approval have been issued regarding soil erosion that will further ensure protection of public health, safety, and welfare upon final engineering of the project and are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. (COA: 10.BS GRADE.02)
- b) The subdivision may be located on expansive soil; however, California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining all structures will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As IBC requirements are applicable to all structures they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

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

Source: Flood Control District review, Building and Safety – Grading Review, Project Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located near the channel of a river, or stream, or the bed of a lake. Thus the proposed subdivision does not change deposition, siltation or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake.

b) The subdivision may result in an increase in water erosion either on or off site. Riverside County Flood Control has provided standard conditions of approval to ensure erosion impacts are mitigated to less than significant levels upon final engineering and are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. (COA: 10.BS GRADE.02 and 10.BS GRADE.04)

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located within a HIGH wind erosion area. All projects proposing grading are condition for dust control (COA: 10.BS GRADE.05) The RCIP, Safety Element Policy for Wind Erosion requires buildings to be designed to resist wind loads which are covered by the California Building Code (CBC). With such compliance, impacts to wind erosion and blowsand from the project on or off site are considered to be less than significant. As no unique mitigation measures are identified, no additional mitigation is required.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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, Departments of Environmental Health and Fire Review

Findings of Fact:

a-b) During construction of the proposed subdivision, 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 proposed subdivision will not create a hazard to the public or the environment.

c) The subdivision has been reviewed by the Riverside County Fire Department for emergency access, and will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan.

d) The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

e) The subdivision is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

21. Airports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<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
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, Project Application Materials, Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Staff Comments, dated May 9, 2008

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The project site is located in Airport Zone E of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. ALUC staff comments, dated May 9, 2008 concluded that the proposed subdivision is not a major land use action and does not require review. Therefore, the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

d) The subdivision is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

22. Hazardous Fire Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				

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

Findings of Fact:

a) According to GIS, the project site is not located in a hazardous fire area. No impacts will occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project				
23. Water Quality Impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors and odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition, Jurupa Area Plan Figure 8 "Flood Hazards"

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed subdivision will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.
- b) The subdivision will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and has been conditioned to comply with standard water quality conditions of approval.
- c) The subdivision will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- d) The subdivision will not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
- e) The subdivision 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.

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

f) The subdivision will not place structures within a 100 flood hazard area which would impede and/or redirect flows. Additionally, the project has been conditioned to contain the 100 year food storm flow within the street right of way. (COA: 10.BS GRADE.11). However, this is considered a standard CEQA mitigation measure, no unique mitigation is required.

g) The proposed subdivision will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and it will not substantially deplete or degrade groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

h) The subdivision will not include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors and odors).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

24. Floodplains

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

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

b) The subdivision will not substantially change absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff.

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

c) The subdivision 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.

d) The subdivision will not cause changes in the amount of surface water in any water body.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

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

Source: RCIP, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The subdivision would not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land of the area.

b) The subdivision does not affect land use within a city sphere of influence or within adjacent city or county boundaries.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

26. Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

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

- a) The subdivision is consistent with the site’s proposed zoning Light Agriculture (A-1).
- b) The surrounding zoning is Light Agriculture - 1 Acre Minimum (A-1-1) to the north, south and east, and General Commercial (C-1/CP) to the west. The subdivision will be compatible with the surrounding zoning classifications.
- c) The project site is designated Community Development: Low Density Residential (CD: LDR) (1/2 Acre Minimum) in the RCIP and is within the Equestrian Sphere Policy Area of the Jurupa Area Plan. Surrounding properties area also designated Rural Community: Low Density Residential (RC: LDR) (1/2 Acre Minimum) to the north, Community Development: Low Density Residential (CD: LDR) (1/2 Acre Minimum) to the south and east, and Community Development: Public Facilities (CD: PF) (< 0.60 Floor Area Ratio) to the west.
- d) The subdivision is consistent with current land use designations and the policies of the RCIP.
- e) The subdivision will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
27. Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is within MRZ-3, which is defined as areas where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist; however, the significance of the deposit is undetermined.

The RCIP identifies policies that encourage protection for existing mining operations and for appropriate management of mineral extraction. A significant impact that would constitute a loss of availability of a known mineral resource would include unmanaged extraction or encroach on existing extraction. No existing or abandoned quarries or mines exist in the area surrounding the project site.

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

The subdivision does not propose any mineral extraction on the project site. Any mineral resources on the project site will be unavailable for the life of the project; however, the subdivision will not result in the permanent loss of significant mineral resources.

b) The subdivision will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State. The subdivision will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

c) The subdivision will not be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine.

d) The subdivision 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 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, Project Application Materials, Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Staff Comments, dated May 9, 2008

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project site is located in Airport Zone E of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. ALUC staff comments, dated May 9, 2008 concluded that the proposed subdivision is not a major land use action and does not require review. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels.

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.

29. Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

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

Findings of Fact:

The project site is located approximately 300 feet west of the Union Pacific Railroad. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

30. Highway Noise

NA A B C D

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

Findings of Fact:

The project site is located approximately 4.3 miles east of Interstate Highway -15 and approximately 3 miles north of State Highway 60. The project's land uses would not be sensitive to highway noise; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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:

No other noise sources have been identified near the project site that would contribute a significant amount of noise to the project.

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

Source: Project Application Materials, Riverside County General Plan Noise Element; Riverside County Noise Ordinance No. 847

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed subdivision will not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the subdivision.
- b) The subdivision might create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the subdivision vicinity above levels existing without the project. However, all noise generated during project construction and the operation of the site must comply with the County's noise standards, which restricts construction (short-term) and operational (long-term) noise levels. Therefore, any potential noise impact is considered less than significant.
- c) The subdivision will not cause 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) Persons might be exposed to groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction and operation of the project; however, to minimize ambient noise levels during construction and operation of the project, construction and operation shall be restricted substantially to daylight hours.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project				
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	<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
housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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) The subdivision will not necessitate the construction or replacement of housing elsewhere; although the project currently has an existing single family residence on proposed Parcel 4, no displacement of existing housing will occur.
- b) The subdivision could create a demand for additional housing; however, any demand will be accommodated on the housing market and any development will be required to develop per the General Plan.
- c) The subdivision will not displace any people.
- d) The project site is located within the Jurupa Valley Redevelopment Project Area (JVPA) (Pedley sub-area); the Riverside County Economic Development Agency (EDA) reviewed the proposed subdivision and it found it to be consistent with the objectives of the Jurupa Valley Redevelopment Project Area.
- e) The subdivision will not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections.
- f) Development of the proposed project site will have a less than significant impact on inducing substantial population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

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:

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact:

The proposed subdivision will have no impact on the demand for Fire services. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall comply with the provision of Ordinance No. 659 which requires payment of the appropriate fees set forth in the Ordinance. Ordinance 659 is established to set forth policies, regulations and fees related to the funding and construction of facilities necessary to address the direct a cumulative environmental effect generated by new development projects. With compliance to Ordinance No. 659, impact to Fire services is viewed as less than significant.

Additionally, the subdivision with not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associate with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. As such, this project will not cause the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response ties or other performance objectives for any of the public services.

Any project subject to Ordinance No. 659 will be conditioned for compliance. Compliance with Ordinance No. 659 is not considered a unique mitigation measure. No additional mitigation is identified or required. (COA: 10.PLANNING.19)

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

The proposed subdivision will have no impact on the demand for Sheriff services. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall comply with the provision of Ordinance No. 659 which requires payment of the appropriate fees set forth in the Ordinance. Ordinance 659 is established to set forth policies, regulations and fees related to the funding and construction of facilities necessary to address the direct a cumulative environmental effect generated by new development projects. With compliance to Ordinance No. 659, impact to Sheriff services is viewed as less than significant.

Additionally, the subdivision with not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associate with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. As such, this project will not cause the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response ties or other performance objectives for any of the public services.

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

Any project subject to Ordinance No. 659 will be conditioned for compliance. Compliance with Ordinance No. 659 is not considered a unique mitigation measure. No additional mitigation is identified or required. (COA: 10.PLANNING.19)

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:

The proposed subdivision is located within the Jurupa Unified School District. The impact of the project is considered less than significant.

Additionally, the subdivision will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the new provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically alter governmental facilities. As such, this project will not cause the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations and performance objectives for any public services.

These projects have been conditioned to comply with School Mitigation Impact fees in order to mitigate the potential effects to school services. This is a standard condition of approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation (COA 80.PLANNING.07). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

37. Libraries

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

The proposed subdivision will have no impact on the demand for Library services. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall comply with the provision of Ordinance No. 659 which requires payment of the appropriate fees set forth in the Ordinance. Ordinance 659 is established to set forth policies, regulations and fees related to the funding and construction of facilities necessary to address the direct a cumulative environmental effect generated by new development projects. With compliance to Ordinance No. 659, impact to Library services is viewed as less than significant.

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

Additionally, the subdivision will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. As such, this project will not cause construction 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.

Any project subject to Ordinance No. 659 will be conditioned for compliance. This is not a unique mitigation measure. No further mitigation measures have been identified; no additional or unique mitigation is required. (COA: 10.PLANNING.19)

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

38. Health Services

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

The construction of health service buildings in conjunction with the proposed development is not anticipated. Existing health services facilities will serve the site.

Additionally, the subdivision will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. As such, this project will not cause construction 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.

Any project subject to Ordinance No. 659 will be conditioned for compliance. This is not a unique mitigation measure. No further mitigation measures have been identified; no additional or unique mitigation is required. (COA: 10.PLANNING.19)

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

RECREATION

39. Parks and Recreation

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

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

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

c) Is the project located within a C.S.A. or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Source: GIS 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, Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District correspondence – Letter dated May 12, 2008 from Frank Guerrero, Assistant to the General Manager

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed subdivision does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities as well as it does not include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities.

c) The project is not located within a C.S.A. but is located within the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District. According to the Letter from the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District dated May 12, 2008 the proposed project will have a less than significant impact with mitigation (Quimby fees Ord. 460) because the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District has Landscape Maintenance District responsibilities for developments within their jurisdictional boundaries.

Mitigation: The permit holder shall present certification to the Director of the Department of Building and Safety that payment of parks and recreation fees and/or dedication of land for park use in accordance with Section 10.35 of Ordinance No. 460 has taken place. Said certification shall be obtained from the Jurupa Area Recreation and Parks District (COA: 50.PLANNING.21 and 90.PLANNING.02).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Department of Building and Safety plan check process.

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

Source: Riverside County Parks, RCIP Figure C-7 “Trails and Bikeway System”

Findings of Fact:

The Jurupa Area Plan identifies a ten to fourteen foot (10'-14') wide trail along Pedley Road.

Mitigation: Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the applicant shall submit a trails plan to the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District for review and approval. This trails plan shall show the trail with all topography, cross-sections, grading, fencing, signage and landscaping. (COA: 60.PARKS.1)

Monitoring: Monitoring will be conducted by the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District and Building and Safety through the permitting process.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project				
---	--	--	--	--

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
41. Circulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP, Transportation Department Review, Project Trip Generation Analysis, Ord. No. 348, Ord. No 659

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed project site will have a less than significant impact on an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. The project site would not result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads or congestion at intersections.
- b) Development of the proposed project site will have no impact that will result in inadequate parking.
- c) The project will have a less than significant impact on the level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways.
- d) Development of the project will have a less than significant impact on circulation that would result in a change in traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.
- e) Development of the project site will have no impact on circulation altering waterborne, rail or air traffic.

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

- f) Development of the proposed project site would have no impact on circulation substantially increasing hazards to a design feature or incompatible uses.
- g) Development of the proposed project site would have less than significant impact on circulation causing an effect upon, or need for new or altered maintenance of roads.
- h) Development of the proposed project site would have a less than significant impact on circulation because there are improvements that are going to be constructed.
- i) Development of the proposed project site would have no impact on circulation resulting in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses.
- j) Development of the proposed project site would have no impact on circulation conflicting with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

42. Bike Trails

Source: Riverside County Parks, RCIP Figure C-7 "Trails and Bikeway System"

Findings of Fact:

The Jurupa Area Plan identifies a ten to fourteen foot (10'-14') wide trail along Pedley Road.

Mitigation: Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the applicant shall submit a trails plan to the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District for review and approval. This trails plan shall show the trail with all topography, cross-sections, grading, fencing, signage and landscaping. (COA: 60.PARKS.1)

Monitoring: Monitoring will be conducted by the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District and Building and Safety through the permitting process.

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The Jurupa Community Services District will service the subdivision with water. The Riverside County Department of Environmental Health has reviewed this subdivision. The subdivision does not require or will not result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.

b) There is a sufficient water supply available to serve the subdivision from existing entitlements and resources. This subdivision has been conditioned to comply with the requirements of the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health. Water and sewer shall be installed in accordance with the requirements of the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health.

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 Jurupa Community Services District will service the subdivision with sewer services. The Riverside County Department of Health has reviewed this subdivision. The subdivision will not require or will not 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) This subdivision has been conditioned to comply with the requirements of the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health. Water and sewer shall be installed in accordance with the requirements of the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary.

45. Solid Waste

a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence – Letter dated June 2, 2008 from Mirtha Liedl, Planner.

Findings of Fact:

a) The subdivision will not substantially alter existing or future solid waste generation patterns and disposal services. The landfill that will serve the project has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's anticipated solid waste disposal needs.

b) The development will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are necessary.

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, Ord. No 517, Ord. No. 659

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The subdivision will require utility services in the form of Electricity, Natural gas, and Telecommunications. Utility service infrastructure is available to the project site and the subdivision is not anticipated to create a need for new facilities.

d) Storm water drainage will be handled on-site.

e-f) Street lighting exists for the access to the project site. Overall, the subdivision will have an incremental impact on the maintenance of public facilities, including roads.

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

g) The subdivision will not require additional government services.

h) The project design does not conflict with 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 to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Implementation of the proposed subdivision 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. Mitigation measures have been incorporated to protect any biological that may potentially exist on the site.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

The proposed subdivision does not have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals. Both short-term and long-term environmental goals are being met through the mitigation placed on the project and the project design.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

49. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15130)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

The subdivision does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. All cumulative impacts resulting from this project and those around it have been evaluated as part of this Initial Study and the EIR prepared for the General Plan.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

The proposed subdivision would not result in environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

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.
- Jurupa Area Plan.
- SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook
- County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 2162 prepared by Soil Exploration Company, Inc., dated May 5, 2009
- Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Staff Comments, dated May 9, 2008
- Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District correspondence – Letter dated May 12, 2008 from Frank Guerrero, Assistant to the General Manager
- Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence – Letter dated June 2, 2008 from Mirtha Liedl, Planner.

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

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