

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 39184
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Tentative Tract Map No. 31667, Change of Zone No. 06850
Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department
Address: 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92502
Contact Person: Mark Staples, Project Planner
Telephone Number: (951) 955-5132
Applicant's Name: Trans-Pacific Consultants, Inc.
Applicant's Address: 27431 Enterprise Circle West, Temecula, CA 92590

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description:

Tentative Tract Map No. 31667 is a Schedule A subdivision that proposes to subdivide two lots totaling 35.2 acres into 114 single family residential lots, 2 open space lots, and a 1.67 acre park site.

Change of Zone No. 06850 proposes a change from Rural Residential (R-R) to Single Family Residential (R-1) to allow a minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet.

The project site is located on the northwest corner of Grand Avenue and McVicar Street.

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

C. Total Project Area: 35.2 acres

Residential Acres: 35.2	Lots: 114	Units: 114	Projected Number of Residents: 295
Commercial Acres:	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Industrial Acres:	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Other:			

D. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 380-060-007, 380-060-008

E. Street References: The project site is located on the northwest corner of Grand Avenue and McVicar Street

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:
Section 2; Township 7 South; Range 4 West

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The project site contains a potentially historic house with 2 metal barns, a water tank, and three smaller service building which all served as elements of a grazing farm, but is now just used as residential structures or storage. There is existing large lot single family residential to the west, east and south. The Wildomar Flood Control Channel runs along the northern property line.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE POLICIES AND ZONING

A. General Plan Designation(s): Medium Density Residential

B. Land Use Planning Area Information

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

C. Area Plan Land Use Allocation Map Information

- 1. Area Plan, if any: Elsinore
- 2. Area Plan Land Use Designation, if any: Medium Density Residential

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: Rural Residential

F. Proposed Zoning, if any: Single Family Residential

G. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Rural Residential to the north, east, and south, and Single Family Residential to the west.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED
<input type="checkbox"/> I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.
<input type="checkbox"/> 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

Mark Staples, Project Planner
Printed Name

June 27, 2005

Date

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

Source: Riverside County Integrated Plan, Figure C-9 “Scenic Highways”, Elsinore Area Plan, Figure 9 “Scenic Corridors”.

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located within or adjacent to a Scenic Highway. Additionally, the site does not contain scenic resources or unique features such as mature trees or rock outcroppings.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 655

Findings of Fact: The project is located approximately 28.23 miles from the Mt. Palomar Observatory, and is therefore subject to Riverside County Ordinance No. 655, Zone B lighting standards. The intent of Ordinance No. 655 is to restrict the permitted use of certain light fixtures emitting into the night sky undesirable light rays, which have a detrimental effect on astronomical observation and research. Ordinance No. 655 contains approved materials and methods of installation, definition, general requirements, requirements for lamp source and shielding, prohibition and exceptions. With

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

the incorporation of project lighting requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 into the proposed project, this impact will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation: All project lighting shall comply with the requirements within Riverside County Ordinance No. 655. The Building and Safety Department will review lighting plans to verify conformance with Ordinance No. 655. (Condition of Approval 50.PLANNING.20)

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided by the Building and Safety Department during the permit review process.

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: Site Visit, Project Description

Findings of Fact: The project would not create substantial light and glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, or expose residential property to unacceptable levels of light or glare. The proposed project will provide a single-family residential development. The project site is in immediate proximity of other existing and planned similar uses.

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 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, "Phase I: Environmental Site Assessment" by Kent Norton, REA, dated August 18, 2003

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

Findings of Fact: The project site is designated as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance, but is not currently under a Williamson Act contract. A "Phase I: Environmental Site Assessment" was prepared by Kent Norton, REA, stated that the site was historically used for low intensity agricultural uses such as grazing. However, the current state of the property showed that the property had not been actively used for grazing for some time. The existing barns and other support buildings were being used for equipment and vehicle storage with no evidence of agricultural activity.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. Air Quality Impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 6-2

Findings of Fact: Residential developments, such as the proposed project, primarily impact air quality almost exclusively through increased automotive emissions. Single projects typically do not generate enough traffic and associated air pollutants to individually violate clean air standards. It is typically the cumulative effect of hundreds of such developments that causes the small incremental contribution from any one development to become cumulatively significant.

The SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook establishes a single family residential project of 166 units as the threshold of significance from an air quality standpoint (Table 6-3). The proposed project, of 114 lots, falls below this threshold. In addition, a residential project such as that proposed is not identified as emitting toxic air pollutants or odors and does not cause changes in area climate. No long-term impacts can occur and no mitigation is required for long-term impacts; however, construction activities associated with the proposed project may result in short term air pollutant emissions.

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

Implementation of the proposed project is not anticipated to 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. The emission of objectionable odors is not anticipated during construction and the ongoing uses of the proposed project.

Mitigation: In order to avoid potential impacts related to short-term air quality during the construction phase, the project shall comply with the following conditions of approval: 10.BS GRADE.4

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided by the Planning Department and Building and Safety Department.

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 policy or ordinance?

Source: MSHCP, Review by County Biologist, and a habitat assessment by Thomas Leslie Corporation dated December 8, 2003.

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

Findings of Fact: This project is not located within an MSHCP criteria cell and is not subject to the Riverside County HANS process. However, the site is located within the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Mitigation Fee Area as designated by the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency.

A field survey for Burrowing owls was conducted on December 8, 2003. Burrowing owls were not observed, nor were critical habitat features discovered such as rodent or other burrows, molted feathers, cast pellets, prey remains, eggshell fragments, or excrement at or near a burrow entrance. The habitat assessment identified that the project site was a vacant field of moderate to dense growth of low "weedy" vegetation such as Dove Weed, Short-pod Mustard, and Vinegar Weed. None of these plants support burrowing owl habitat.

The Riverside County Environmental Programs Department has conditioned the project to comply with the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, any vegetation or tree removal, or grading occurring between February 1 to August 15 shall require a qualified biologist to conduct a nesting bird survey no more than one week prior to grading.

Mitigation: Potential adverse impacts to wildlife and vegetation resources shall be mitigation through the payment of the SKR Mitigation Fee (Condition of Approval 60.PLANNING.16), payment of the open space mitigation fee that serves to fund the MSHCP (Condition of Approval 90.PLANNING.15), and compliance with the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (Condition of Approval 60.PLANNING.23)

Monitoring: Monitoring will occur during the Building and Safety permit 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Site visit, Project Application Materials and "A Cultural Resources Assessment" prepared by Robert S. White and Laurie S. White, April 14, 2004; Letter from Marc Brewer to Trans-Pacific Consultants, Inc. dated April 27, 2005

Findings of Fact: The results of the records search and the field study were completely negative for prehistoric resources.

The field study resulted in the identification of a ranch complex (Rudolph Brown Ranch) within the study area that is over 50 years of age, which included a Ranch House, a Tank House, two corrugated Steel Barns, and three smaller service buildings. The primary building, the Ranch House, comprises the Rudolph J. Brown residence, which was evaluated for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) by Dr. David Van horn (Architectural Historian). None of the buildings qualify as eligible for the CRHR under Criteria (A) or (C) because it is not associated with any historical event nor are any of the buildings architecturally unique. However, in consideration of Criterion B, it may be observed that the Brown family were pioneering farmers and ranchers of the area and they are recognized as a locally prominent family. The Brown ranch complex appears eligible for the CRHR at the local level under Criterion B and merits special consideration in planning.

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

It is recommended that prior to demolition, each building or structure be thoroughly photographed. Demolition of the buildings and subsequent grading of the building locations should be monitored by a qualified archaeologist. In the event that buried deposits of historical material are unearthed, all work in that area should be halted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the find.

Mark Brewer, Park Planner for the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District, determined that the following mitigation measures were appropriate for the complex given its historic significance and current condition:

1. The [Ranch] House shall be photo documented.
2. The Tank House shall be retained and possibly moved to an alternate location.
3. Remainder of Site should be Photo Documented at a minimal level with only a measured site plan required.
4. Due to historic significance of important person, a family history shall be written and available to the public.

Mitigation: Historic resources mitigation shall be accomplished through the Park's Conditions of Approval 60.PARKS.1, 60.PARKS.2, 60.PARKS.3, 80.PARKS.1, and 60.PLANNING.24

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided by the Park's Department

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

Source: Site visit, Project Application Materials and "A Cultural Resources Assessment" prepared by Robert S. White and Laurie S. White, April 14, 2004; Letter from Marc Brewer to Trans-Pacific Consultants, Inc. dated April 27, 2005

Findings of Fact: The results of the records search and the field study were completely negative for prehistoric resources.

The field study resulted in the identification of a ranch complex (Rudolph Brown Ranch) within the study area that is over 50 years of age. The primary building comprises the Rudolph J. Brown residence, which was evaluated for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) by Dr. David Van horn (Architectural Historian). None of the buildings qualify as eligible for the CRHR under Criteria (A) or (C) because it is not associated with any historical event nor are any of the buildings architecturally unique. However, in consideration of Criterion B, it may be observed that the Brown family were pioneering farmers and ranchers of the area and they are recognized as a locally prominent family. The Brown ranch complex appears eligible for the CRHR at the local level under Criterion B and merits special consideration in planning. It is recommended that prior to demolition,

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

each building or structure be thoroughly photographed. Demolition of the buildings and subsequent grading of the building locations should be monitored by a qualified archaeologist. In the event that buried deposits of historical material are unearthed, all work in that area should be halted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the find.

Mark Brewer, Park Planner for the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District, determined that the following mitigation measures were appropriate for the complex given its historic significance and current condition:

5. The [Ranch] House shall be photo documented.
6. The Tank House shall be retained and possibly moved to an alternate location.
7. Remainder of Site should be Photo Documented at a minimal level with only a measured site plan required.
8. Due to historic significance of important person, a family history shall be written and available to the public.

Mitigation: Historic resources mitigation shall be accomplished through the Park's Conditions of Approval 60.PARKS.1, 60.PARKS.2, 60.PARKS.3, 80.PARKS.1, and 60.PLANNING.24

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided by the Park's Department

9. Paleontological Resources

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 site is not identified as being located in a paleontological sensitive area. No paleontological resources are indicated.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Definitions for Land Use Suitability Ratings

Where indicated below, the appropriate Land Use Suitability Rating(s) has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable S - Generally Suitable PS - Provisionally Suitable
 U - Generally Unsuitable R - Restricted

a. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones

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?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A-P Zones	NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PS <input type="checkbox"/>	U <input type="checkbox"/>	R <input type="checkbox"/>
CFH Zones	NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PS <input type="checkbox"/>	U <input type="checkbox"/>	R <input type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP Elsinore Area Plan Figure 12 "Seismic Hazards", GIS Database, and Project Review

Findings of Fact: A number of seismic and related hazards are present in the Elsinore planning area. The most significant seismic hazard is the Elsinore fault, which runs north south through the center of the area. However, the project site is not located within a fault zone.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

11. Liquefaction Potential Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
NA <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PS <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/> R <input type="checkbox"/>				

Source: RCIP Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction", GIS Database, County Geological Report No. 1278 by SID Geotechnical, Inc., dated August 25, 2003

Findings of Fact: According to figure S-3 of the RCIP and the GIS Database, the project site is located within a low to moderate liquefaction area. The field investigation for County Geological Report No. 1278 did not find any groundwater. It should be noted that further geotechnical review will be required for proposed grading and foundations prior to issuance of grading permits.

Mitigation: The project shall comply with the recommendations made based on County Geologic Report No. 1278 (Condition of Approval 10.PLANNING.16).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided by the Building and Safety Department.

12. Ground-shaking Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strong seismic ground shaking?				
NA <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PS <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/> R <input type="checkbox"/>				

Source: Uniform Building Code

Findings of Fact: The County Department of Building and Safety requires construction to conform to the Uniform Building Code. Upon compliance with Riverside County requirements related to geotechnical and soil reports, the potential impact of the proposed project due to ground shaking will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation: The applicant shall submit a soils report for review and approval prior to any grading activity. All construction shall comply with the Uniform Building Code (Conditions of Approval 10.BS GRADE.2 and 60.BS GRADE.4).

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

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided through the Building and Safety permit process.

13. Landslide Risk

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?

NA S PS U R

Source: On-site Inspection, RCIP Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability"

Findings of Fact: Due to the relatively level terrain in the area, the project site is not subject to landslide, collapse, or rock fall hazards. In addition, the project site is not located within an area subject to unstable geologic units or soil.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

14. Ground Subsidence

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: The project site is not located in an area subject to unstable geologic units or soil, including ground subsidence.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

15. Other Geologic Hazards

Such as seiche, mudflow or volcanic hazard?

Source: Site visit, Project Application

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located in an area subject to seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
16. Slopes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 sewage disposal systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riv. Co. 800 Scale Slope Maps and Ordinance No. 457

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will change the topography of the project site. Compliance with riverside County Ordinance No. 457 will reduce the potential impacts due to changes in topography and cut and fill slopes as a result of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

The proposed project does not require the use of any septic systems.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

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

Findings of Fact: The development of the project site may have the potential to result in soil erosion during grading and construction. In addition, the site is largely covered with soils generally exhibiting low to moderate expansiveness. With submittal of a grading plan, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and incorporating the following mitigation measures, potential impacts to soil will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation: The project shall submit a soils report, comply with NPDES, and develop and implement a SWPPP per Conditions of Approval 60.BS GRADE.4 and 60.BS GRADE.13

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided through the Building and Safety Department permit process

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

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

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

Findings of Fact: The proposed project may temporarily change deposition, siltation, or erosion on or off site. The following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts related to erosion to less than significant levels.

Mitigation:

1. Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following rough grading to prevent deposition of debris onto downstream properties or drainage facilities. (60.BS GRADE.3)
2. The project shall incorporate county grading standards, best management practices and a SWPPP to eliminate significant erosion hazards. (60.BS GRADE.13)

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided through the Building and Safety permit process.

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

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

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located within a High or Very High wind erosion area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the	<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
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

environment?

Source: RCIP and Project Review

Findings of Fact: During construction 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. According to the RCIP, no sources of existing health hazards are known to exist on the project site or in the vicinity. In addition, the project site is not located on or near an identified hazardous waste site. Therefore, no potential exists to expose people to such sources.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

21. Airports

a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?

b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?

c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

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: According to the RCIP, the project site is outside of the Airport-Influence Area for any public or private airports. Because of the project site's location in relation to existing airports within the area, implementation of the proposed project will not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan or require review by the Airport Land Use Commission. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two mile of a public airport or public use airport that would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The project site is also not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, which would 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

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?

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

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

Findings of Fact: The project is not located in a high fire area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project

23. Water Quality Impacts

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

b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

d) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed 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, 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 which would impede or redirect flood flows?

g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Source: Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report.

Findings of Fact: This is a proposal to subdivide 36.6 acres into residential lots and an open space lot in the Wildomar area. The site is located at the north corner of Grand Avenue and McVicar Street.

The northeast portion of the site lies within the 100-year Zone A floodplain limits for Wildomar Channel as delineated on Panel No. 060245 2710C of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps issued in conjunction with the National Flood Insurance Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Additionally, a large portion of the site is within a Zone B floodplain which is shallow flooding from the hills to the southwest.

The applicant has submitted a floodplain/floodway study with the Master Drainage Plan flow rates for Wildomar Channel. The study has been reviewed and acceptable to the District in determining the

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

floodway limits. The applicant proposes to encroach into the floodplain with residential lots up to the floodway limits while also respecting projected streambank lines and grades from upstream development. The fill slope/bank protection shall be constructed to District standards including access. As this encroachment would raise the 100 year water surface in the channel, permission shall be obtained by the affected property owners on the opposite side of the channel. Two of the three affected property owners have submitted letters of permission. The developer is diligently pursuing the third permission. If this permission can not be obtained it will be necessary to redesign the project to eliminate the impact. The threshold of significance for this impact will be based on the judgement of the General Manager-Chief Engineer.

The tentative map designates the overbank area between the proposed bank protection and the District's existing undersized Wildomar Channel as a park site. If a viable public maintenance entity such as a parks district or equivalent is willing to accept maintenance responsibility for this amenity, the District has no objection to the proposal. A homeowners association would not be an acceptable maintenance entity. In any case the area between the stream bank and low-flow channel is critical to the function of the channel system and shall be dedicated to the public for flood control purposes.

The finished pad elevations shall be a minimum of 2 feet above the 100-year water surface or a minimum of 1 foot above the floodway elevation for Wildomar Channel, whichever is higher.

The applicant proposes a storm drain and inlets in Grand Avenue to collect the tributary storm flows from the hills the southwest. This storm drain would outlet to Wildomar Channel downstream of McVicar Street.

This site is located within the bounds of the Murrieta Creek/Wildomar Valley Area Drainage Plan (ADP) for which drainage fees have been established by the Board of Supervisors. Applicable ADP fees will be due (in accordance with the Rules and Regulations for Administration of Area Drainage Plans) prior to permits for this project. Although the current fee for this ADP is \$4,952 per acre, the fee due will be based on the fee in effect at the time of payment. The fee is payable to the Flood Control District by cashier's check or money order only. The District will not accept personal or company checks.

Mitigation: The project shall comply with the Riverside County Flood Control District conditions of approval based on the project's Flood Hazard Report (Conditions of Approval 10.FLOOD RI.2, 10.FLOOD RI.3, 10.FLOOD RI.4, 10.FLOOD RI.5, 10.FLOOD RI.6, 10.FLOOD.7, 10.FLOOD.9, 10.FLOOD.10, 10.FLOOD.16, 10.FLOOD.17, 10.FLOOD.18, and 10.FLOOD.19).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided by the Riverside County Flood Control District and the Building and Safety Department.

24. Floodplains

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

NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	U - Generally Unsuitable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	R - Restricted <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
on- or off-site?				
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: 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

Findings of Fact: This is a proposal to subdivide 36.6 acres into residential lots and an open space lot in the Wildomar area. The site is located at the north corner of Grand Avenue and McVicar Street.

The northeast portion of the site lies within the 100-year Zone A floodplain limits for Wildomar Channel as delineated on Panel No. 060245 2710C of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps issued in conjunction with the National Flood Insurance Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Additionally, a large portion of the site is within a Zone B floodplain which is shallow flooding from the hills to the southwest.

The applicant has submitted a floodplain/floodway study with the Master Drainage Plan flow rates for Wildomar Channel. The study has been reviewed and acceptable to the District in determining the floodway limits. The applicant proposes to encroach into the floodplain with residential lots up to the floodway limits while also respecting projected streambank lines and grades from upstream development. The fill slope/bank protection shall be constructed to District standards including access. As this encroachment would raise the 100 year water surface in the channel, permission shall be obtained by the affected property owners on the opposite side of the channel. Two of the three affected property owners have submitted letters of permission. The developer is diligently pursuing the third permission. If this permission can not be obtained it will be necessary to redesign the project to eliminate the impact. The threshold of significance for this impact will be based on the judgement of the General Manager-Chief Engineer.

The tentative map designates the overbank area between the proposed bank protection and the District's existing undersized Wildomar Channel as a park site. If a viable public maintenance entity such as a parks district or equivalent is willing to accept maintenance responsibility for this amenity, the District has no objection to the proposal. A homeowners association would not be an acceptable maintenance entity. In any case the area between the stream bank and low-flow channel is critical to the function of the channel system and shall be dedicated to the public for flood control purposes.

The finished pad elevations shall be a minimum of 2 feet above the 100-year water surface or a minimum of 1 foot above the floodway elevation for Wildomar Channel, whichever is higher.

The applicant proposes a storm drain and inlets in Grand Avenue to collect the tributary storm flows from the hills the southwest. This storm drain would outlet to Wildomar Channel downstream of McVicar Street.

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

This site is located within the bounds of the Murrieta Creek/Wildomar Valley Area Drainage Plan (ADP) for which drainage fees have been established by the Board of Supervisors. Applicable ADP fees will be due (in accordance with the Rules and Regulations for Administration of Area Drainage Plans) prior to permits for this project. Although the current fee for this ADP is \$4,952 per acre, the fee due will be based on the fee in effect at the time of payment. The fee is payable to the Flood Control District by cashier's check or money order only. The District will not accept personal or company checks.

Mitigation: The project shall comply with the Riverside County Flood Control District conditions of approval based on the project's Flood Hazard Report (Conditions of Approval 10.FLOOD RI.2, 10.FLOOD RI.3, 10.FLOOD RI.4, 10.FLOOD RI.5, 10.FLOOD RI.6, 10.FLOOD.7, 10.FLOOD.9, 10.FLOOD.10, 10.FLOOD.16, 10.FLOOD.17, 10.FLOOD.18, and 10.FLOOD.19).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided by the Riverside County Flood Control District and the Building and Safety Department.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

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

Source: RCIP, GIS, Project Materials

Findings of Fact: The RCIP has properties north of Grand Avenue and west of McVicar Street designated as Medium Density Residential allow 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre. Properties to the east of McVicar Street and south south of Grand Avenue are either Low Density Residential or Estate Density Residential. The project site is located at the northwest corner of Grand Avenue and McVicar Street, with a Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential. The proposed project has a density of 3.24 units per acre, which is consistent with the existing land use designation.

The proposed project is not within a city sphere of influence. Therefore, the project will have no impact.

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
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an	<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
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

established community (including a low-income or minority community)?

Source: RCIP Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS

Findings of Fact: The RCIP has properties north of Grand Avenue and west of McVicar Street designated as Medium Density Residential allow 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre. Properties to the east of McVicar Street and south south of Grand Avenue are either Low Density Residential or Estate Density Residential. The project site is located at the northwest corner of Grand Avenue and McVicar Street, with a Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential. The proposed project has a density of 3.24 units per acre, which is consistent with the existing land use designation.

However, the existing zoning designation is Rural Residential, which allows a maximum density of 2 units per acre. The applicant is proposing a Change of Zone to Single Family Residential to allow minimum lot sizes of 7,200 square feet and maximize the density allowed by the Medium Density Residential Land Use designation. This is consistent with existing and planned surrounding land uses.

The intersection of Grand Avenue and McVicar Street serves as the transition between Medium Density, Low Density and Estate Density Residential uses.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

27. Mineral Resources

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

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

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

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

Source: RCIP Figure MS-5 “Mineral Resources Area”

Findings of Fact: No mineral resources have been identified on the project site and there is no historical use of the site or surrounding area for mineral extraction purposes. No impacts are anticipated as a result of the implementation of the proposed project.

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
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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: RCIP Figure S-19 "Airport Locations", County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that would expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels; or within the vicinity of a private airstrip, that would expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

29. Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

Source: RCIP Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", S-21 "Rail Facilities, Available Water, Oil and Natural Gas Pipelines Inventory Data", Thomas Guide 2002 Edition, Site Visit

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located near an active railroad line. No impacts will occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

30. Highway Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Application materials, Site Visit, Project Exhibit

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

Findings of Fact: The project site is more than one mile west of Interstate 15. Therefore, there will be no impact from highway noise.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source: Project description and materials

Findings of Fact: No other noise pollution sources are anticipated to impact the project site.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

32. Noise Effects on or by the Project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project materials and description

Findings of Fact: The proposed project in itself will not create additional noise, but future single-family development will create unavoidable incremental noise. Grading and construction shall be restricted to daylight hours in order to reduce noise impacts in the evening. Construction equipment shall be required to be maintained in good working order and cannot be serviced or repaired at the site. The construction of single-family residences will result in an increase of noise levels, but these increased noise levels will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
33. Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project description and materials, GIS

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will not have a significant impact related to 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. The proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or displace substantial numbers of people. The proposed project will not create permanent employment opportunities. Therefore, it will not create a demand for additional housing. The proposed project will not affect County Redevelopment Area or cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

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

Source: RCIP Safety Element, Ordinance No. 659, and Project Review

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will have an incremental increase in the potential need for fire services. Additionally, the proposed project shall be required to pay development impact fees established by Ordinance No. 659. Upon compliance with ordinance No. 659, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on fire services.

Mitigation: Mitigation shall be payment of development impact fees (10.PLANNING.13).

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

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided through the Building and Safety permit process

35. Sheriff Services

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will have an incremental increase in the potential need for sheriff services. This increase will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the payment of fees. Upon compliance with Ordinance No. 659, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on sheriff services.

Mitigation: Mitigation shall be payment of development impact fees (10.PLANNING.13).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided through the Building and Safety permit process

36. Schools

Source: Lake Elsinore Unified School District

Findings of Fact: The project site is located within the Lake Elsinore Unified School District. The implementation of the proposed subdivision will result in an increased number of students and need for additional classrooms and is expected to require an incremental increase in the need for educational services. This increase will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the payment of fees. With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measures, the proposed project will not have a significant impact on schools.

Mitigation: The project shall pay school fees per Condition of Approval 80.PLANNING.14

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided through the Building and Safety permit process

37. Libraries

Source: RCIP and Project Review

Findings of Fact: The proposed subdivision will result in an incremental increased demand for library services. This increase will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the payment of fees. With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure, the project will not have a significant impact on library services.

Mitigation: Mitigation shall be payment of development impact fees (10.PLANNING.13).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided through the Building and Safety permit process

38. Health Services

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

Source: RCIP and Project Review

Findings of Fact: The proposed subdivision will result in an incremental increased demand for health services. This increase will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the payment of fees. With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure, the project will not have a significant impact on health services.

Mitigation: Mitigation shall be payment of development impact fees (10.PLANNING.13).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided through the Building and Safety permit process

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)?

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

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will be developing a 1.67 acre park on the northern portion of the project site adjacent to the Wildomar Channel. The applicant has agreed to maintain the park through a HOA (Homeowner’s Association). The proposed park shall conform to the following mitigation measures through the conditions of approval.

Mitigation: Construction of a park (Condition of Approval 100.PLANNING.1 and 100.PLANNING.2) and payment of Quimby fees (Condition of Approval 50.PLANNING.6)

Monitoring: Monitoring of the park plans shall be conducted by the Riverside County Planning Department.

40. Recreational Trails

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

Findings of Fact: The project is providing a 10 foot wide trail easement along Grand Avenue. Maintenance for the trail shall be accomplished by forming or annexing to a maintenance district.

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

Mitigation: Mitigation for the creation and maintenance of a trail shall be through Conditions of Approval 10.PLANNING.5, 50.PLANNING.35, and 60.PLANNING.2.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided by the Planning Department.

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

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The Transportation Department has reviewed the traffic study submitted for the referenced project. The study has been prepared in accordance with County-approved guidelines. We generally concur with the findings relative to traffic impacts.

The General Plan circulation policies require a minimum of Level of Service 'C', except that Level of Service 'D' may be allowed with Board of Supervisors' approval in community development areas at intersections of any combination of secondary highways, major highways, arterials, urban arterials, expressways or state highways and ramp intersections.

The study indicates that it is possible to achieve adequate Level of Service for the following intersections based on the traffic study assumptions.

Central Street (EW) at:

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

Grand Avenue (NS)

Project Access (EW) at:
Grand Avenue (NS)

McVicar Street (EW) at:
Palomar Street (NS)
Project Access (NS)
Grand Avenue (NS)

Palomar Street (NS) at:
Clinton Keith Road (EW)

Clinton Keith Road/I-15 interchange currently operates at an unacceptable level of service. The County has determined that interim improvements will provide an acceptable Level of Service for near term condition. Long range impacts will be mitigated through ultimate improvements for which the project will fee.

The associated conditions of approval incorporate mitigation measures identified in the traffic study, which are necessary to achieve or maintain the required level of service.

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned for road improvements and improved signalization (Conditions of Approval 50.TRANS.3, 50.TRANS.4, 50.TRANS.5, 50.TRANS.6, 50.TRANS.29, 50.TRANS.30, 90.TRANS.2, and 90.TRANS.3.)

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Riverside County Transportation Department.

42. Bike Trails

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: The project is providing a 10 foot wide trail easement along Grand Avenue that is accessible for bicycle travel. Maintenance for the trail shall be accomplished by forming or annexing to a maintenance district.

Mitigation: Mitigation for the creation and maintenance of a trail shall be through Conditions of Approval 10.PLANNING.5, 50.PLANNING.35, and 60.PLANNING.2.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be provided by the Planning Department.

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

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

project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact: The proposed project is located within the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD) water services area. Service to the proposed project will be dependent upon the available capacity of the EVMWD systems at the time service agreements are made with the purveyor. The proposed residential development may have an impact upon water resources or availability. With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on utility and service systems related to water.

Mitigation: The developer shall obtain a “will serve” letter from EVMWD per Conditions of Approval 50.E HEALTH.1, 50.E HEALTH.2, 50.E HEALTH.3, 50.E HEALTH.4.

Monitoring: Monitoring will be done by the Riverside County Environmental Health and Building and Safety Departments.

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 which 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: The proposed project is located within the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD) sewer services area. Service to the proposed project will be dependent upon the available capacity of the EVMWD systems at the time service agreements are made with the purveyor. The proposed residential development may have an impact upon water resources or availability. With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on utility and service systems related to water.

Additionally, the property has existing septic tanks that must be abandoned.

Mitigation: The developer shall obtain a “will serve” letter from EVMWD per Conditions of Approval 50.E HEALTH.1, 50.E HEALTH.2, 50.E HEALTH.3, 50.E HEALTH.4, and 60.E HEALTH.1.

Monitoring: Monitoring will be done by the Riverside County Environmental Health and Building and Safety Departments.

45. Solid Waste

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

Source: RCIP, Letter from Riverside County Waste Management

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will not impact solid waste disposal.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

46. Utilities

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

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

Source: RCIP and Project Review

Findings of Fact: Southern California Edison will provide electricity to the site. There is adequate electrical generating capacity to serve the site and the proposed project would not require the expansion of existing facilities or the construction of new facilities, which would have a significant environmental effect. Southern California Gas will provide gas to the site. There is adequate natural gas and associated distribution facilities to serve the site and the proposed project would not require the expansion of existing facilities or the construction of new facilities, which would have a significant environmental effect. Verizon will provide telephone service to the site. There is adequate capacity at existing Verizon facilities to serve the site and the proposed project would not require the expansion of existing facilities or the construction of new facilities, which would have a significant environmental effect. The site has been designed to provide adequate storm water drainage. Development of the site is also tied to the provision of adequate regional storm water facilities. The impacts associated with the provision of these regional facilities will be fully mitigated through the Flood Control District. The proposed project has also been conditioned to provide streetlights. Streetlights will be installed within the road right-of-way and as a result will have a less than significant impact on the environment. Increased maintenance of public facilities or requirements for additional governmental services from the proposed project is expected to have a less than significant impact on the environment. The residential development will be designed to meet the energy conservation requirements within the

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

State's Uniform Building Code and are not expected to conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

OTHER

47. Other:

Source: Staff review

Findings of Fact: N/A

Mitigation:

Monitoring:

OTHER

48. Other:

Source: Staff review

Findings of Fact: N/A

Mitigation:

Monitoring:

OTHER

49. Other:

Source: Staff review

Findings of Fact: N/A

Mitigation:

Monitoring:

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

50. 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

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

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?

Source: Staff review, Application materials

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

51. 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 which 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Staff review, Project application

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

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

Source: Staff review, project application

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

53. Does the project have environmental effects which 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

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

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

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

Title:	Prepared by:	Date:
RCIP: Riverside County Integrated Project	Jacobs Engineering	October 2003
“Cultural Resources Assessment”	Thomas Leslie Corporation	April 14, 2004
Letter from Riverside County Parks to Trans-Pacific Consultants	Marc Brewer	April 27, 2005
Habitat Assessment for Burrowing Owl	Thomas Leslie Corporation	December 8, 2003
“Phase I: Environmental Site Assessment”	Kent Norton, REA	August 18, 2003
Geological Report No. 1278	SID Geotechnical, Inc.	August 25, 2003
Tentative Tract Map No. 31667, Amended No. 3	Trans-Pacific Consultants	October 25, 2004

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

Location:	Address:
Planning	County of Riverside Planning Department
	4080 Lemon Street, 9 th Floor
	Riverside, CA 92502