COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 39459
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Change of Zone No. 06941, Tentative Parcel Map No. 31303
Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department
Address: P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92505-1409
Contact Person: Chris Stamps, Project Planner
Telephone Number: (951) 955-2402
Applicant's Name: Engineering Ventures
Applicant's Address: 43500 Ridge Park Drive, Suite 202, Temecula, CA 92590

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description:

Change of Zone No. 06941 is a proposal to change the existing Residential Agricultural – 20 acre minimum (R-A-20) zone to Residential Agricultural – 5 acre minimum (R-A-5).

Tentative Parcel Map No. 31303 is a Schedule H proposal to subdivide 18.01 acres into two, 5-acre minimum residential lots.

- **B.** Type of Project: Site Specific \boxtimes ; Countywide \square ; Community \square ; Policy \square .
- C. Total Project Area: 18.01 gross acres

| Residential Acres: 18.01 | Lots: 2 | 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 Other: N/A | Lots: N/A | Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: N/A | Est. No. of Employees: N/A |

- D. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 932-160-050, 932-160-051
- **E. Street References:** This project is located north of Avenida Presa, south of Tenaja Road, west of Calle Viento, and east of Calle Roble.
- F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description: Section 32, Township 7 South, Range 4 West
- **G.** Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The project is located on rolling hills with elevations ranging from approximately 2,105 feet to 2,235 feet above mean sea level. The project site is vacant land covered with non-native grasses and dense native vegetation. An artificial reservoir is located on the southeastern portion of the project area. An existing residence and horse corrals are located to the northwest of the project. The project is surrounded by vacant land and scattered single family residences.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE POLICIES AND ZONING

- A. General Plan Designation(s): Rural Mountainous (RM)
- B. Land Use Planning Area Information

Page 1 of 28

- 1. Subarea, if any: N/A
- 2. Policy Area, if any: Santa Rosa Plateau Policy Area

C. Area Plan Land Use Allocation Map Information

- 1. Area Plan, if any: Southwest Area Plan
- 2. Area Plan Land Use Designation, if any: Rural Mountainous (RM)

D. 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
- **E. Existing Zoning:** Residential Agricultural 20 acre minimum (R-A-20)
- F. Proposed Zoning, if any: Residential Agricultural 5 acre minimum (R-A-5)
- **G.** Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R), Residential Agricultural 5 acre minimum (R-A-5), Residential Agricultural 20 acre minimum (R-A-20)

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

| Aesthetics | 🛛 Hazards & Hazardous Materials | Public Services |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Agriculture Resources | Hydrology/Water Quality | Recreation |
| Air Quality | Land Use/Planning | Transportation/Traffic |
| Biological Resources | Mineral Resources | Utilities/Service Systems |
| Cultural Resources | 🗋 Noise | Other |
| Geology/Soils | Population/Housing | Mandatory Findings of Significance |

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED

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

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

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

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment **NOTHING FURTHER IS REQUIRED** because all potentially significant effects (a) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

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

Chris Stamps Printed Name For Robert C. Johnson, Planning Director

V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| AESTHETICS Would the project | | | | |
| 1. Scenic Resources | | | | \boxtimes |
| a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway | | | | |
| corridor within which it is located? | | | | |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, | | | | \boxtimes |
| 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? | | | | |
| Source: RCIP Figure C-7 "Scenic Highways" | | | | |
| <u>Findings of Fact:</u> The project is not located within a scenic h damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, landmark features. The project site will not obstruct any prom | rock outcro | oppings and ι | unique or | 2 |

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

public, or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory

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

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 655

<u>Findings of Fact:</u> The project site is approximately 28.43 miles from the Mt. Palomar Observatory and is within Zone B of Riverside County Ordinance No. 655. The intent of this ordinance is to restrict the permitted use of certain light fixtures emitting undesirable light rays into the night sky, which have detrimental effects upon astronomical observation and research. The applicant shall comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 in regards to lighting policies and 50.PLANNING.24 of the conditions of approval. The incorporation of these mitigation measures will reduce the potential impacts to a level of insignificance.

Page 4 of 28

 \boxtimes

| | 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. | | | | |
| 3. Other Lighting Issues | | | | \square |
| 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? | | | \boxtimes | |
| <u>Source:</u> Site Visit, Project Description <u>Findings of Fact:</u> The proposed subdivision will not create a which would adversely affect day or night views in the area. residences to unacceptable light levels. <u>Mitigation:</u> No mitigation measures are required. <u>Monitoring:</u> No monitoring measures are required. <u>AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</u> 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 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? | | | | |

Source RCIP Figure OS-17 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database and Project Materials.

<u>Findings of Fact:</u> The proposed subdivision will not cause the conversion of any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agriculture use. The project site has a Farmland designation of Grazing Land. The project will not conflict with any existing agriculture uses in the area. The subject site is not under Williamson Act (Agricultural Preserve) contract. The project will not cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property.

Page 5 of 28

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impac |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| The project will not cause significant changes in the existing conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses. | environmen | it which could | l result in | |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | |
| AIR QUALITY Would the project | | | | |
| 5. Air Quality Impactsa) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | | | | \boxtimes |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | | \boxtimes | |
| 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)? | | | | |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions? | | | | |
| e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter? | | | | \boxtimes |
| f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | | |

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 6-2, Project Review

<u>Findings of Fact:</u> Short-term impacts in air quality may occur during grading and construction activities. Emissions from construction equipment and dust during individual parcel development will be generated by the project. As such, the applicant has been conditioned to comply with County Ordinance No. 457 (grading) and 10.BS GRADE.5 with regards to dust control measures.

Since the impacts to air quality are temporary, and there are no sensitive receptors in the area, the overall air quality impacts are not anticipated to be significant. Implementation of the proposed project will not emit objectionable odors in the project vicinity that would affect a substantial number of people. Grading and construction activities for the proposed project would involve activities and the use of equipment typical of residential development.

<u>Mitigation:</u> No mitigation measures are required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| PIOLOCICAL DESOLIDCES . Would the project | | | | |
| BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project 6. Wildlife & Vegetation | | \boxtimes | | |
| 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 | | | \boxtimes | |
| 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 | | | \boxtimes | |
| 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? | | | 57 | |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any | | | \boxtimes | |
| 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 | | | | \square |
| 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? | | | | <u> </u> |
| f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally | | | | \bowtie |
| 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 | | | | \square |
| protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation | | | _ | |
| policy or ordinance? | | | | |

Source: GIS Database, Site Visit, PDB No. 3228, Letters from EPD dated June 30, 2005

<u>Findings of Fact:</u> The Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan indicates that the project site is located within MSHCP Cells 6765-J and 6872-J. The project has completed the HANS and RCA JPR and received clearance to proceed with the planning process in letters date June 30, 2005. No conservation is required for this property.

A habitat assessment for the California red-legged frog, three narrow endemics, and two criteria area plant species was prepared by Thomas Leslie Corporation and dated September 30, 2004. The survey was conducted on September 16 and September 24, 2004, the time of year when the red-legged frog would not have been present or identifiable. However, no suitable habitat for the California red-legged frog was identified within the boundaries of the survey area. Therefore no further study for the red-legged frog is needed since suitable habitat is absent from the project site.

| Potential Significar Impact | | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|

No specimens of the three narrow endemic plant species or the two criteria area plant species were found during the survey dates. However, the presence of suitable habitat on the project site indicates that the presence of these plant species may occur. The project will be required to conduct focused surveys on these plant species.

<u>Mitigation:</u> The project is conditioned in 10.PLANNING.1 to conduct focused surveys on the three narrow endemic plant species and the two criteria area plant species during their flowering periods in a normal rainfall year.

<u>Monitoring</u>: Monitoring shall be provided by the Riverside County Building and Safety Department Plan Check process and the Planning Department.

| CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project | | |
|--|-------------|--|
| 7. Historic Resources | \boxtimes | |
| a) Alter or destroy an historic site? | | |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the | \boxtimes | |
| significance of a historical resource as defined in California | | |
| Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5? | | |

Source: Site visit, Project Application Materials

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report for Tentative Parcel Map No. 31303, prepared by CRM TECH and dated August 23, 2004, identified no historical resources within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause substantial adverse change to any known historical resources. Although no artifacts were found on the surface, the potential for unearthing cultural/historical resources is high considering the close proximity of a known Native American village site only 200 meters southwest of the project. All grading, grubbing, trenching, excavations, and/or other earth-moving activities associated with the proposed project will be monitored by a qualified archaeologist.

<u>Mitigation:</u> The project is conditioned in 60.PLANNING.24 to retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor grading activities.

<u>Monitoring:</u> Monitoring shall be provided by the Riverside County Building and Safety Department Plan Check process and the Planning Department.

| 8. Archaeological Resources | | \boxtimes |
|--|--|-------------|
| a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site. | | |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the | | \square |
| significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to | | |
| California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5? | | |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred | | \boxtimes |
| outside of formal cemeteries? | | |
| d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the | | \boxtimes |
| potential impact area? | | |

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

Source: Project Application Materials

<u>Findings of Fact:</u> The Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report for Tentative Parcel Map No. 31303, prepared by CRM TECH and dated August 23, 2004, identified no archaeological resources within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause substantial adverse change to any known archaeological resources. Although no artifacts were found on the surface, the potential for unearthing archaeological resources is high considering the close proximity of a known Native American village site only 200 meters southwest of the project. All grading, grubbing, trenching, excavations, and/or other earth-moving activities associated with the proposed project will be monitored by a qualified archaeologist.

<u>Mitigation:</u> The project is conditioned in 60.PLANNING.24 to retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor grading activities.

<u>Monitoring</u>: Monitoring shall be provided by the Riverside County Building and Safety Department Plan Check process and the Planning Department.

| 9. Paleontological Resources a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature? | | | | |
|---|------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|
| | | | | |
| Source: RCIP Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity" | | | | |
| Findings of Fact: The project is not located within a Paleont | ological S | ensitivity A | rea. | |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project | | | | |
| 10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County | | | | \bowtie |
| Fault Hazard Zones | | | | |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death? | | | | |
| b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, | | | | \square |
| as delineated on the most recent Alguist-Priolo Earthquake | | | | |
| Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area | | | | |
| or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? | | | | |
| Source: Geologist Comments | | | | |
| Findings of Fact: The proposed project is not located within | a delinea | ted Alquist- | Priolo Eartho | luake |
| Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zone. | | | | |

Page 9 of 28

| | 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. | | | | |
| 11. Liquefaction Potential Zone a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | | |
| Source: RCIP Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction" | | | | |
| Findings of Fact: The proposed project site is not within a | potential Liqu | efaction Haz | zard Area. | |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | |
| 12. Ground-shaking Zone Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking? | | | \square | |
| Source: RCIP Figure S-18 "Inventory of Hazardous Materi | als" | | | |
| <u>Findings of Fact:</u> The project site is located within a Ground General Plan identifies or rates the site as being suitable (n impacts from groundshaking can be lessened through comp Code Seismic Design requirements and the building permit | ormal to low pliance with t | risk) for that he current Ui | zone. Pote | ential |
| 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: On-site Inspection, RCIP Figure S-5 "Regions Une | derlain by Ste | eep Slope" | | |
| Findings of Fact: The project site is not located within a geo would become unstable as a result of the project, and poter lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards. | • | | | |

Mitigation: No monitoring measures are required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| 14. Ground Subsidence a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable,or that would become unstable as a result of the project,and potentially result in ground subsidence? | | | | |
| Source: Resolution No. 94-125, RCIP | | | | |
| Findings of Fact: There is no indication that the geologic unit unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in groups of the project. | | | ould becom | e |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | |
| 15. Other Geologic Hazardsa) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard? | | | | |
| Source: Site visit, Project Application | | | | |
| Findings of Fact: This project is not subject to geologic haza volcanic hazard. | ards, such a | is seiche, mu | idflow, or | |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | |
| 16. Slopesa) Change topography or ground surface relief features? | | | | |
| b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet? | | | \square | |
| c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems? | | | \boxtimes | |
| Source: Riv. Co. 800 Scale Slope Maps | | | | |
| <u>Findings of Fact</u> : The project will not create cut or fill slopes and will not result in grading that affects or negates subsurfact change in the site's topography as a result of the grading is c | ce sewage | disposal syst | ems. The | feet, |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| | | Incorporated | | | |
| 17. Soils a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | | | | |
| b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | | | | | |
| Source: U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, Svisit | Staff Review | , application | materials, s | site | |
| <u>Findings of Fact</u> : During grading activities, there is a potential for the loss of some topsoil due to erosion. Compliance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 457 shall minimize erosion during on-site development. The applicant shall comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 457 and 10.BS GRADE.4 of the conditions of approval to minimize erosion potential during on-site development. | | | | | |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | | |

| 18. Erosion | | \boxtimes |
|---|--|-------------|
| a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may | | |
| modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake? | | |
| b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or | | \boxtimes |
| off site? | | |

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

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The project is not located near a channel of a river, stream, or bed of a lake and will not result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

Source: RCIP Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. 460, Sec. 14.2 & Ord. 484

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The project site is not subject to impacts from blowsand or wind erosion and will not result in an increase in blowsand or wind erosion.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

Page 12 of 28

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the pro | iect | | | |
| 20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials | | | | \square |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the | | | | |
| environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal | | | | |
| of hazardous materials? | | | | |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the | | | | \bowtie |
| environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and | | | | |
| accident conditions involving the release of hazardous | | | | |
| materials into the environment? | | | | |
| c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with | | | | \bowtie |
| an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency | | | | |
| evacuation plan? | <u> </u> | | | |
| d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within | | | | \square |
| one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | | | | |
| e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of | | | | \square |
| hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to | | | | |
| Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would | | | | |
| it create a significant hazard to the public or the | | | | |
| environment? | | | | |

Source: Project materials

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The proposed project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The proposed residential development poses a low level risk of hazards similar to other surrounding residential development. In addition, construction activities would be subject to strict regulations related to the use or the potential for release of hazardous materials into the environment. The proposed project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

There would be no threat of hazardous emissions or hazardous materials and waste as a result of the development of the proposed project to existing adjacent residential uses and the schools in the vicinity. The proposed project is not listed as a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the release of hazardous materials, or emissions nor would the project create a significant hazard to the public or environment. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

| 21. Airports | | | \boxtimes |
|---|--|-------|-------------|
| a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master | | | |
| Plan? | | | |
| b) Require review by the Airport Land Use | | | \boxtimes |
| Commission? | | | |
| c) For a project located within an airport land use plan | | | \boxtimes |
| Page 13 of 28 | | | _ |
| Ű | | EA No | o. 39459 |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | |
| d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | |
| Source:RCIP Figure S-19 "Airport Locations"Findings of Fact:The proposed project is located outside the not be impacted by nor will impact an airport.Mitigation:No mitigation measures are required.Monitoring:No monitoring measures are required. | e two-mile ra | adius of any a | airport and | will |
| 22. Hazardous Fire Area a) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | | | | |

Source: RCIP Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility," Riverside GIS

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The project site is located in the "Hazardous Fire Area" of Riverside County as shown on a map on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Riverside County Fire Department to lessen potential significant adverse impacts resulting from the project site is being located in a high fire area.

<u>Mitigation</u>: Prior to recordation of the final map, the applicant shall be required to prepare an Environmental Constraints Sheet (ECS) stamped with several notes pertaining to fire issues:

| 50.FIRE.1 | MAP-#7-ECS – HAZ FIRE AREA |
|-----------|---------------------------------|
| 50.FIRE.2 | MAP-#43-ECS – ROOFING MATERIAL |
| 50.FIRE.3 | MAP-#64-ECS – DRIVEWAY ACCESS |
| 50.FIRE.4 | MAP-#73-ECS – DRIVEWAY REQUIRED |
| 50.FIRE.5 | MAP-#88-ECS – AUTO/MAN GATES |
| 50.FIRE.6 | MAP-#98-ECS – HYDRANT |

The applicant has also has been conditioned to furnish water system plans as stated in 50.FIRE.6 of the conditions of approval.

<u>Monitoring</u>: Monitoring shall be provided by the Riverside County Fire Department prior to the recordation of the final map and by the Department of Building and Safety Plan Check process.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| | | | | |
| HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project | | | | |
| 23. Water Quality Impacts | | | | \bowtie |
| a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of | | | | |
| the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a | | | | |
| stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial | | | | |
| erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | | | <u> </u> |
| b) Violate any water quality standards or waste | | | | \bowtie |
| discharge requirements? | | | | <u> </u> |
| c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or | | | | \bowtie |
| interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that | | | | |
| there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering | | | | |
| of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production | | | | |
| rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which | | | | |
| would not support existing land uses or planned uses for | | | | |
| which permits have been granted)? | — | | | |
| d) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed | | | | \bowtie |
| the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage | | | | |
| systems or provide substantial additional sources of | | | | |
| polluted runoff? | | | | |
| e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, | | | | \boxtimes |
| as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood | | | | |
| Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | | |
| f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures | | | | \boxtimes |
| which would impede or redirect flood flows? | F -1 | — | | |
| g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | | | |
| h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment | | | | \bowtie |
| 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)? | | | | |

Source: Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report.

<u>Findings of Fact:</u> The topography of the project site consists of well-defined ridges and natural watercourses that traverse the property. There is adequate area outside of the natural watercourses for building sites. The natural watercourses should be kept free of buildings and obstructions in order to maintain the natural drainage patterns of the area and to prevent flood damage to new buildings. The project will not result in the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner, which could result in substantial erosion on or off site. The project does not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will not effect ground water supplies, nor create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The project is not located within a 100-year flood zone.

The project shall be required to minimize any potential construction related water quality impacts. At the time of development, the Riverside County Building and Safety Grading Department will review the proposed project for compliance with county codes and requirements to protect hydrology and water quality.

Page 15 of 28

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

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 🖂 | U - Generally Unsuitable | | R - Rest | ricted |
|---|------------------------------|--|-------------|-----------|
| a) Substantially alter the ex | isting drainage pattern of | | \boxtimes | |
| the site or area, including throug | h the alteration of the | | | |
| course of a stream or river, or su | ibstantially increase the | | | |
| rate or amount of surface runoff | in a manner that would | | | |
| result in flooding on- or off-site? | | | | |
| b) Changes in absorption ra | ites or the rate and amount | | \boxtimes | |
| of surface runoff? | | | | |
| c) Expose people or structure | res to a significant risk of | | \boxtimes | |
| loss, injury or death involving flo | oding, including flooding as | | | |
| a result of the failure of a levee of | or dam (Dam Inundation | | | |
| Area)? | | | | |
| d) Changes in the amount of | of surface water in any | | | \square |
| water body? | | | | |

<u>Source</u>: RCIP 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

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The GIS data states that the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. Future development at the project site has the potential to incrementally increase the amount of runoff water that leaves the project site. These impacts shall be mitigated to a level of insignificance through project design and conditions of approval imposed by the Riverside County Flood Control District.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

| LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project | | |
|---|--|-------------|
| 25. Land Use | | \square |
| a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or | | |
| planned land use of an area? | | |
| b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence | | \boxtimes |
| and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries? | | |

Source: RCIP, GIS, Project Materials

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The project proposes to alter the existing zoning of Residential Agricultural – 20 acre minimum (R-A-20) to Residential Agricultural – 5 acre minimum (R-A-5). This change of zone is considered a less than significant alteration of the planned land use of the area. The project is not

Page 16 of 28

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

adjacent to a city or county boundaries and will not affect the land use within a city or county sphere of influence.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: RCIP Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The current zoning classification for the subject property is Residential Agricultural – 20 acre minimum (R-A-20). The project is surrounded by properties zoned Residential Agricultural – 20 acre minimum (R-A-20), Residential Agricultural – 5 acre minimum (R-A-5), and Rural Residential (R-R). The applicant submitted a change of zone application to change the zone from R-A-20 to R-A-5. The tentative map, which proposes a minimum parcel size of 5 acres, is consistent with the proposed R-A-5 zoning. The project is located in the Santa Rosa Plateau Policy Area which allows 5 acre minimum parcels within the Rural Mountains designation.

The project site is currently vacant and surrounded by vacant lands and scattered single-family residences. The project's intent is consistent with the existing and planned surrounding land uses. The project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

| MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project | | | |
|--|--|------|-------------|
| 27. Mineral Resources | | | \boxtimes |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral | | | |
| resource in an area classified or designated by the State | | | |
| that would be of value to the region or the residents of the | | | |
| State? | | | |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important | | | \boxtimes |
| mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general | | | |
| Page 17 of 28 | | | |
| Ŭ | | EA N | o. 39459 |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | | | | |
| plan, specific plan or other land use plan? c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine? | | | | |
| d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines? | | | | \boxtimes |
| Source: RCIP Figure MS-5 "Mineral Resources Area" Findings of Fact: The project will not result in the loss of ava | ailability of k | nown importa | ant mineral | |
| resources. The project is a compatible land use since it is no designated area or existing surface mine. The project is not | ot adjacent to | o a State clas | ssified or | mine. |
| 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 NA - Not Applicable A - Generally Acceptable C - Generally Unacceptable D - Land Use Discourage 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 □ B □ C □ D □ | ; | | ecked. onally Acce | eptable |
| 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 \square A \square B \square C \square D \square | | | | |
| Source: RCIP Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," County of Ri | verside Airp | ort Facilities | Мар | |
| Findings of Fact: The project site is not located within two mi | les of a pub | lic airport or | private airs | trip. |
| 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 |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| 29. Railroad Noise NA ⊠ A □ B □ C □ D □ | | | | \square |
| Source: RCIP Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", S-21 "Rail Fac Gas Pipelines Inventory Data", Thomas Guide 2005 Edition, | | able Water, C | il and Natu | ıral |
| Findings of Fact: The project site is located in excess of five not be impacted by railroad noise. | (5) miles fr | om railroad ti | rack, and sl | nall |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | |
| 30. Highway Noise NA ⊠ A □ B □ C □ D □ | | | | \boxtimes |
| Source: Application materials, Site Visit, Project Exhibit | | | | |
| Findings of Fact: The proposed parcel map is located in a re Riverside County. Due to the low traffic volumes from the ne will not be significant. | | | | |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | |
| 31. Other Noise NA ⊠ A □ B □ C □ D □ | | | | \square |
| Source: Project description and materials | | | | |
| Findings of Fact: It is anticipated that no other noise pollutio | n sources w | vill impact the | project site | Э. |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | |
| 32. Noise Effects on or by the Project a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | | |
| b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | \boxtimes | |
| c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan | | | | \square |
| Page 19 of 28 | | | EA No. | 39459 |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | | | | |
| d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels? | | | | \boxtimes |
| Source: Project materials and description | | | | |

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The proposed project will create unavoidable incremental increases in noise levels. However, due to the low residential density that exists in the area, and the distance between dwellings, the increases in noise level will not be significant. During construction, it is anticipated that there will be a temporary increase in noise levels; however these noise levels are not expected to reach significant levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

| POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project | | |
|--|------|-------------|
| 33. Housing | | \boxtimes |
| a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, | | |
| necessitating the construction of replacement housing | | |
| elsewhere? | | |
| b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly | | \bowtie |
| housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of | | |
| the County's median income? | | |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, | | \boxtimes |
| necessitating the construction of replacement housing | | |
| elsewhere? | | |
| d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area? | | \boxtimes |
| e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local | | \boxtimes |
| population projections? | | |
| f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, | | \boxtimes |
| either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and | | |
| businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of | | |
| roads or other infrastructure)? | | |

Source: Project description and materials, GIS

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The proposed subdivision will not have a adverse impact upon population and housing in Riverside County. Future development of single-family homes will increase the number of available housing units and the population in the area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| | | | | |
| PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in substant the provision of new or physically altered government faci altered governmental facilities, the construction of which of impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, re- objectives for any of the public services: | lities or the nee could cause sig | ed for new or nificant envi | [·] physically ronmental | d with |
| 34. Fire Services | | | \boxtimes | |
| | | | | |
| Source: RCIP Safety Element <u>Findings of Fact</u> : The proposed subdivision will not create future single-family residences will incrementally increase construction must comply with the Riverside County Deve | the need for fir | re protection | . All reside | ntial |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. 35. Sheriff Services | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 35. Sheriff Services | rcement. All re | esidential co | es, but futur | |
| 35. Sheriff Services Source: RCIP <u>Findings of Fact</u> : The proposed parcel map will not signific single-family residence will increase the need for law enforted for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will increase the need for the signific single family residence will signific single | rcement. All re | esidential co | es, but futur | |
| 35. Sheriff Services Source: RCIP Findings of Fact: The proposed parcel map will not signific single-family residence will increase the need for law enfor comply with the Riverside County Development Mitigation | rcement. All re | esidential co | es, but futur | |
| 35. Sheriff Services Source: RCIP <u>Findings of Fact</u> : The proposed parcel map will not signific single-family residence will increase the need for law enfoc comply with the Riverside County Development Mitigation <u>Mitigation</u> : No mitigation measures are required. | rcement. All re | esidential co | es, but futur | |
| 35. Sheriff Services Source: RCIP Findings of Fact: The proposed parcel map will not signific single-family residence will increase the need for law enfoc comply with the Riverside County Development Mitigation Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | rcement. All re | esidential co | es, but futur | |

<u>Mitigation:</u> No mitigation measures are required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| 37. Libraries | | | \boxtimes | |

Source: RCIP

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The proposed parcel map will not significantly impact library services, but future single-family residence will incrementally increase the need for library services. All residential construction must comply with the Riverside County Development Mitigation fee (Ordinance No. 659.)

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

| 38. | Health Services | | \square | |
|-----|-----------------|--|-----------|--|

Source: RCIP

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The project will create an incremental need for additional medical services. However, these types of services are normally user fee or tax supported services. Additional medical facilities however, will be provided and funded through the Development Mitigation Fee Program administered through the Riverside County Ordinance No. 659. In addition, no shortage in the provision of health care service is expected as a result of the proposed parcel map.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: GIS, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35, Ord. No. 659, Parks & Open Space Department Review

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The project will not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The project does not include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks. The project is not located within a Community Service Area or Park District with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan.

| | 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. | | | | |
| 40. Recreational Trails | | | | \square |
| Source: Riv. Co. 800 Scale Equestrian Trail Maps, Open S County trail alignments | pace and Co | onservation N | /lap for We | stern |
| Findings of Fact: A review by the County Parks and Recreational trails were not planned for the project area. The upon the Riverside County recreational and equestrian trails | project shal | | | npact |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | |
| TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project 41. Circulation 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)? | | | | |
| b) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | | | | \boxtimes |
| c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion | | | | |
| management agency for designated road or highways? 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? | | | | |
| e) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic? | | | | \boxtimes |
| f) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? | | | | |
| g) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads? | | | \boxtimes | |
| h) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction? | | | \boxtimes | |
| i) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? | | | | \boxtimes |
| j) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative | | | | \square |

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

Source: RCIP

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The project will cause an incremental increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system; however, this increase is considered less than significant. The proposed tentative parcel map will not result in inadequate parking capacity since each lot will be served by a driveway. The two proposed lots for this project will not exceed level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways. The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns or alter waterborne, rail or air traffic. The project will not substantially increase hazards to a design feature. The project may cause an effect upon or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads, and will be required to provide all street improvements and road dedications in accordance with Ordinance 460 and 461. The proposed tentative parcel map may cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction, but the impact is temporary and considered less than significant. The project will not result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses. Lastly, the proposal will not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

| 42. Bike Trails | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|-------------|--|-------------|
| | 42. | Bike Trails | | \boxtimes |

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: There are no bike trails near the vicinity of the proposed parcel map.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

| UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project | | |
|---|--|-------------|
| 43. Water | | \boxtimes |
| 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 | | \boxtimes |
| project from existing entitlements and resources, or are | | |
| new or expanded entitlements needed? | | |

<u>Source</u>: Department of Environmental Health Review, Letter from Rancho California Water District dated March 22, 2004

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The project will not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The project is located within the boundaries of Rancho California Water District and there are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

Page 24 of 28

| | 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. | | | | |
| 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 <u>Findings of Fact</u> : The project will require the construction of and will be required to adhere to the regulations and requirer sewage disposal as specified by the Department of Environm 60.E HEALTH.1. | nents for th | e constructio | n of domes | tic |
| Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required. | | | | |
| Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required. | | | | |
| 45. Solid Waste a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | | |
| b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)? | | | | |

Source: RCIP, Letter from Riverside County Waste Management, dated April 5, 2004

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The proposed subdivision is expected to have an impact upon the area landfills, however overall impacts are expected to be less than significant. No objections or concerns were raised by the Riverside County Waste Management Department.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

| Potenti Signific Impa | cant | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----------------------------|------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| | | Incorporated | Impact | |

46. Utilities

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

| | \boxtimes | |
|--|-------------|--|
| | \boxtimes | |
| | \square | |
| | | |

Source: RCIP

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: The project will not require or result in the construction of new community utility or the expansion of existing community utility facilities. The applicant or applicant-in-successor shall make arrangements with each utility provider to ensure each lot is connected to the appropriate utilities. The project is not anticipated to be in conflict, or create any significant impacts associated with the adopted energy conservation plans.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

| OTHER | | |
|------------|--|-------------|
| 47. Other: | | \boxtimes |

Source: Staff review

<u>Findings of Fact</u>: No other issues have been identified during the review of this project and the preparation of this environmental assessment.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

| IDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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? | | | | |
| | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impac |
|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| <u>Source</u> : Staff review, Application materials <u>Findings of Fact</u> : Implementation of the proposed project v environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wild populations to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endang examples of the major periods of California history or prehis | life species, o eliminate a p ered plant or | ause a fish o plant or anim | or wildlife al commun | |
| 49. 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.) | | | | |
| <u>Source</u>: Staff review, Project application <u>Findings of Fact</u>: The proposed project does not have the environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals. 50. Does the project have impacts which are individually | | | -term | |
| So. 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)? | S | | | |
| <u>Source</u> : Staff review, project application <u>Findings of Fact</u> : The project does not have impacts which considerable | n are individu | ally limited, b | out cumulati | vely |
| 51. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | | | | |
| <u>Source</u> : Staff review, project application <u>Findings of Fact</u> : The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly | | | ich would c | ause |

| Si | otentially ignificant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|----|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
|----|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

Phase I Habitat Suitability Assessment, dated September 30, 2004, prepared by Thomas Leslie Corporation

Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report, dated August 23, 2004, prepared by CRM TECH

RCIP: Riverside County Integrated Project

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

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

C:\Documents and Settings\jward\Desktop\toDo\8_31px\PM31303 EA.doc