



RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Charissa Leach
Assistant Director of TLMA
Community Development

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project/Case Number: CEQ200078

Based on the Initial Study, it has been determined that the proposed project, subject to the proposed mitigation measures, will not have a significant effect upon the environment.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES REQUIRED TO AVOID POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. (see Environmental Assessment/Initial Study and Conditions of Approval)

COMPLETED/REVIEWED BY:

By: Brett Dawson Title: Project Planner Date: 2/19/21

Applicant/Project Sponsor: Lauren Mosby Date Submitted: 9/14/20

ADOPTED BY: Planning Director

Person Verifying Adoption:  Date: 2/25/21

The Negative Declaration may be examined, along with documents referenced in the initial study, if any, at:

Riverside County Planning Department 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501

For additional information, please contact Brett Dawson at (951) 955-0972 bdawson@rivco.org.

Revised: 02/19/21

Y:\Planning Master Forms\Templates\CEQA Forms\Cover_Sheet_Mitigated_Negative_Declaration.docx

Please charge deposit fee case#: ZEA

ZCFG

FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (CEQ / EA) Number: CEQ200078
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): CEQ200078
Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department
Address: 4080 Lemon Street 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501
Contact Person: Brett Dawson
Telephone Number: 951-955-0972
Applicant's Name: Lauren Mosby
Applicant's Address: 39964 Via Calina Temecula CA 92592

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Description: Building Grading Permit No. 2000010 (BGR2000010) proposes to grade parcel 1 of PM30618. The grading will consist of a residential pad and driveway for access from Calle Breve. The total disturbance is 5.01 acres proposing earthwork quantities (volume of dirt to be disturbed) of 5,317 cubic yards cut and 4,625 cubic yards of fill; with compaction of 692 cubic yards resulting in zero import or export.

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

B. Total Project Area: 5.01 Gross Acres

Residential Acres: 5.01	Lots: 1	Units: 1	Projected No. of Residents: 4
Commercial Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: N/A	Est. No. of Employees: N/A
Industrial Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: N/A	Est. No. of Employees: N/A
Other: N/A			

C. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 915-220-049

Street References: North of the intersection of Via Calina and Calle Brave

D. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description: Township 7 South, Range 1 West, Section 21

E. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The parcel consists of a vacant lot surrounded by rural residential lots consisting of single family homes.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

- 1. Land Use:** The site's General Plan Designation is Rural: Rural Residential, and surrounded by Rural: Rural Residential Land Use Designations.
- 2. Circulation:** The proposed project is for one single family home, and the existing roads will be sufficient to provide adequate access and circulation for the property. The proposed project meets all other applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.
- 3. Multipurpose Open Space:** The proposed project is located within a rural area designated for residential uses. The project meets all applicable Multipurpose Open Space policies.

4. **Safety:** The proposed project consists of grading for one single family lot. The project meets all applicable safety policies.
5. **Noise:** The only additional noise associated with his project will be during the initial grading. The grading will take place during normal working hours for a limited time. The project meets all applicable Noise policies.
6. **Housing:** The project proposes grading for a residential lot. The proposed project meets all applicable Housing Element policies.
7. **Air Quality:** The proposed project will control any fugitive dust during grading and construction activities pursuant to SCAQMD requirements. The proposed project meets all applicable Air Quality Element policies.
8. **Healthy Communities:** proposed project consists of grading for a single family lot. The project meets all Healthy Community policies.
9. **Environmental Justice (After Element is Adopted):**

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

C. Foundation Component(s): Rural

D. Land Use Designation(s): Rural Residential

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

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

G. Adjacent and Surrounding: Rural: Rural Residential

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

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

3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Rural Residential

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

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

H. Existing Zoning: Residential Agriculture (R-A-5)

I. Proposed Zoning, if any: N/A

J. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Residential Agriculture (R-A-5) and Residential Agriculture (R-A-2 1/2)

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, **NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED** because (a) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible.
- I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An **ADDENDUM** to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.
- I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a **SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.
- I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a **SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant

environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any the following:(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or,(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.



Signature



Date



Printed Name

For: John Earle Hildebrand III
TLMA Deputy Director - Interim
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				
a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure C-8 “Scenic Highways”

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project is not located adjacent to any scenic highways.
- b) The project is located within the Southwest Area Plan. The surrounding area can be characterized by an area of rural residential and vacant graded land. The area and surrounding area has a General Plan Designation of Rural: Residential which permits single family residential uses. Local aesthetic concerns include the potential for negative impacts from the clearing and grading of hillsides. The project proposes grading or ground disturbing activities to support driveways, a septic system, and create two pads for one single family residence and a detached garage. The visual impacts of the grading will not be significant on this site due to the limited scope of grading and topography of the area. Impacts are considered less than significant.
- c) Neighbors will see construction activities, but these impacts will be temporary and therefore will not be significant. The eventual design of the site will re-vegetate the graded areas and introduce a single family residence to comply with the Policy Area. This is typical development for the area

that is not out of the ordinary and would not degrade the existing visual character of the surroundings or conflict with regulations therefore impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is 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(s): GIS database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution)

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located within Zone A of Ordinance 655. It has potential to interfere with the observatory. The project is required to comply with Ordinance No. 655 of the Riverside County Standards and Guidelines. The purpose of Ordinance No. 655 is to restrict the use of certain light fixtures emitting into the night sky that can create undesirable light rays and detrimentally affect astronomical observations and research. Compliance with Ordinance 655 Zone A lighting requirements would reduce potential impacts to Mt. Palomar Observatory to less than significant levels. These requirements are standard and not mitigation for CEQA purposes; therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

3. Other Lighting Issues

a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

Source(s): On-site Inspection, Project Application Description

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed project will not create new light that would be out of the ordinary for the surrounding area; the project only proposes grading activities. Nighttime grading is limited by County Ordinance, thus lights on grading equipment will not be a significant concern. Limited glare may result from the construction equipment and eventual residential dwelling, but will be minimal, temporary and considered less than significant. Any new source of light/glare would be required to not spill over into adjacent properties. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

AGRICULTURE & FOREST 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 zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?

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(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a & d) The proposed project is located on land designated as Other lands, as shown on the Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS). The project is located on a hill. The proposed use, a single family home, (although not analyzed by this EA) is compatible with the surrounding uses, therefore impacts are less than significant.

b-c) The project site is surrounded by vacant land and large-lot single-family residential homes. The proposed grading activity would be for a future single-family residence, which would be similar in scope as previous grading activities in the surrounding vicinity. The proposed grading would not cause any other changes in the existing environment which could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

5. Forest

a) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Govt. Code section 51104(g))?

b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-3a "Forestry Resources Western Riverside County Parks, Forests, and Recreation Areas," Figure OS-3b "Forestry Resources Eastern Riverside County Parks, Forests, and Recreation Areas," Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The County does not have zoning that is specific to the preservation of forest land or timberland. Therefore the proposed project will not conflict with any forest land zoning. Therefore there is no impact.

b&c) The site contains some natural open space; however, none of these are considered forest land per the public resources code. Therefore, the project will not result in the loss of any forest land. Therefore there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project:

6. Air Quality Impacts

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors, which are located within one (1) mile of the project site, to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Climate Action Plan ("CAP"), SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook

Findings of Fact:

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is responsible for developing a regional air quality management plan to ensure compliance with state and federal air quality standards. The SCAQMD has adopted the 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The primary implementation responsibility assigned to the County (I.E. local governments) by the 2003 AQMP is the implementation of air quality control measures associated with transportation facilities. This project does not propose any transportation facilities that would require transportation control measures, and therefore will not obstruct implementation of the AQMP.

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

a) The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The project area is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Basin is a 6,600-square-mile coastal plain bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the southwest and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east. The Basin includes the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties, and all of Orange County.

SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are responsible for preparing the Basin's air quality management plan (AQMP), which addresses federal and state Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements. The AQMP details goals, policies, and programs for improving air quality in the Basin. In preparation of the AQMP, SCAQMD and SCAG use land use designations contained in General Plan documents to forecast, inventory, and allocate regional emissions from land use and development-related sources. For purposes of analyzing consistency with the AQMP, projects that are consistent with the regional population, housing, and employment forecasts identified by SCAG are considered to be consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since the forecast assumptions by SCAG forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP. Additionally, since SCAG's regional growth forecasts are based upon, among other things, land uses designated in County general plans, a project that is consistent with the land use designated in a County's General Plan would also be consistent with the SCAG's regional forecast projections, and thus also with the AQMP growth projections.

The proposed project is consistent with the designated land uses allowed in the Riverside County General Plan and the Southwest Area Plan. Consequently, the growth resulting from project implementation would be consistent with SCAG's regional forecast projections, and, in turn, would also be consistent with the growth projections accounted for in SCAQMD's AQMP. Therefore, the project would not conflict with, or obstruct, implementation of the AQMP and this impact would be less than significant.

b) The relatively small project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment status pursuant to an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Grading of one single driveway and a residential pad for a future single family residential dwelling is considered a minimal effort. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.

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

d) The project proposes grading which will create emissions from grading equipment which may create objectionable odors. These will be temporary and will not impact a substantial number of people because there are only a few neighbors on large lots. Therefore, there is no impact.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
7. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): GIS database, WRCMSHCP and/or CVMSHCP, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site and off-site improvement areas are within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) area. The project site is not located within or adjacent to any Criteria Cells or MSHCP Conservation Areas. In addition, the project site is not located within any MSHCP-required survey areas.

Regarding the MSHCP Section 6.0 (RCA 2003), the following discussion provides information demonstrating that there are no conflicts with this Plan. The project site is located in the MSHCP, within the Sage Area Plan.

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

MSHCP Section 6.1.2 Riparian/Riverine Resources

The MSHCP defines riparian/riverine areas as “lands which contain habitat dominated by trees, shrubs, persistent emergent, or emergent mosses and lichens, which occur close to or which depend upon soil moisture from a nearby fresh water source; or areas with fresh water flow during all or a portion of the year.” The MSHCP further clarifies the definition of riparian/riverine areas as those “demonstrating characteristics as described above which are artificially created are not included in these definitions” (RCA 2003).

In addition, the MSHCP defines vernal pools as, “seasonal wetlands that occur in depression areas that have wetlands indicators of all three parameters (soils, vegetation and hydrology) during the wetter portion of the growing season but normally lack wetlands indicators of hydrology and/or vegetation during the drier portion of the growing season. Obligate hydrophytes and facultative wetlands plant species are normally dominant during the wetter portion of the growing season, while upland species (annuals) may be dominant during the drier portion of the growing season.” It further states that “[t]he determination that an area exhibits vernal pool characteristics, and the definition of the watershed supporting vernal pool hydrology, must be made on a case-by-case basis. Such determinations should consider the length of the time the area exhibits upland and wetland characteristics and the manner in which the area fits into the overall ecological system as a wetland.”

There are no riparian/riverine or vernal pool resources on the proposed project site. Furthermore, species associated with these resources do not occur on the site. Therefore, no impacts to Section 6.1.2 resources would occur.

MSHCP Section 6.1.3 Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area

The proposed project is not located with a Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area.

MSHCP Section 6.3.2 Additional Survey Needs and Procedures

The MSHCP establishes habitat assessment requirements for certain species of plants, birds, mammals, and amphibians depending on a project’s location relative to the required survey area. The project site does not overlap any areas for required additional surveys.

MSHCP Section 6.1.4 Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines

According to the MSHCP, the Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines are intended to address indirect effects associated with locating development in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area (MSHCP, Volume I, pp. 6–42, County of Riverside 2003). The project site is not located within or immediately adjacent to any Criteria Cells, corridors, or linkages, nor any areas described for conservation. As such, the Urban/Wildlife Interface Guidelines do not apply to the proposed project.

In summary, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of the Western Riverside County MSHCP.

- b-c)** The project site is currently vacant other than presence of native vegetation. A detailed desktop analysis was conducted to determine the potential for presence of special-status biological resources in the study area using the following sources: USFWS’s Critical Habitat and Occurrence Data; CDFW’s California Natural Diversity Database; the California Native Plant Society’s online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants; the Calflora database, which compiles observation and plant data from both private and public institutions, including the

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

Consortium of California Herbaria; a Natural Resources Conservation Service soil map; the USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle, and the National Wetland Inventory. The results of the detailed desktop analysis found no potential for sensitive species on site.

The Biological Resources Literature and Records Search concluded that there are no listed species with a potential to occur within the project site or study area. There are no special-status plant or wildlife species with a moderate or high potential to occur.

The County of Riverside Environmental Program Division did not identify the presence of any endangered or threatened species which are listed in the title 14 of the California Codes of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12) in their review of the grading permit associated with this environmental assessment.

Nonetheless, on-site vegetation may potentially be used by migratory birds for breeding. The proposed project has potential to directly impact nesting bird species. To avoid potential impacts to nesting birds, and in conformance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code, Mitigation Measure (MM-) BIO-1 would be implemented.

As such, impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species are not expected Within implementation of MM-BIO-1.

- d) The project site consists of vacant land with native vegetation on site. The project site is within an area surrounding single family homes, and is not the location for any designated wildlife movement corridors or linkages. Therefore, the proposed project would not constrain natural wildlife movement. There is no movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species on the Project site. Additionally, there are no riparian habitats or any sensitive natural communities. There would be a less than significant impact.
- e) No special-status or sensitive vegetation communities are present within the study area or impact footprint. As such, there would be no direct or indirect impacts to riparian vegetation or other sensitive or special-status vegetation communities.
- f) No jurisdictional waters of the United States or state occur within the project site. This includes the absence of federally defined wetlands and other waters (e.g., drainages), state-defined waters (e.g., streams and riparian extent) and vernal pools. The proposed project would be subject to the typical restrictions (e.g., Best Management Practices [BMPs]) and requirements that address erosion and runoff, including those of the Clean Water Act and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.
- g) No other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, have been identified as applicable to the proposed project or project site.

Mitigation:

MM-BIO-1 Preconstruction Nesting Bird Survey and Avoidance Measures. In conformance with the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code, should vegetation clearing, cutting, or removal activities be required during the nesting season (i.e., February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a

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

nesting bird survey within 72 hours of such activities. The survey shall consist of full coverage of the project footprint and an appropriate buffer, as determined by the biologist. If no occupied nests are found, no additional steps shall be required. If nests are found that are being used for breeding or rearing young by a native bird, the biologist shall recommend further avoidance measures, including establishing an appropriate buffer around the occupied nest. The buffer shall be determined by the biologist based on the species present, surrounding habitat, and existing environmental setting/level of disturbance. No construction or ground-disturbing activities shall be conducted within the buffer until the biologist has determined that the nest is no longer being used for breeding or rearing.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:

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

Source(s): On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a - b) Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by Riverside County approved archaeologist Jean Keller in 2003, and a follow up survey completed by Riverside County staff **archaeologist**, on December 26, 2020, it has been determined that there will be no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. Therefore there will be no impacts in this regard.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

9. Archaeological Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): On-Site Inspection, Project Application Materials,

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

Findings of Fact:

A-B) Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by Riverside County approved archaeologist Jean Keller in 2003, and a follow up survey completed by Riverside County staff **archaeologist**, on December 26, 2020, it has been determined that although no cultural resources were identified there is still the possibility that previously unidentified resources might be present subsurface. Therefore the project has been conditioned to have an archaeologist present during ground disturbing activities associated with this project. See CUL 1 With the inclusion of this condition of approval, impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

C) Based on an analysis of records and archaeological survey of the property, it has been determined that the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. Nonetheless, the project will be required to adhere to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 if in the event that human remains are encountered and by ensuring that no further disturbance occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin of the remains. Furthermore, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 (b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and their disposition has been made.

CUL-1

Prior to issuance of grading permits: The applicant/developer shall provide evidence to the County of Riverside Planning Department that a County certified professional archaeologist has been contracted to implement a Cultural Resource Monitoring Program (CRMP). A CRMP shall be developed in coordination with the consulting tribe(s) that addresses the details of all activities and provides procedures that must be followed in order to reduce the impacts to cultural and historic resources to a level that is less than significant as well as address potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources associated with this project. This document shall be provided to the County Archaeologist for review and approval prior to issuance of the grading permit.

The CRMP shall contain at a minimum the following:

Archaeological Monitor An adequate number of qualified archaeological monitors shall be onsite to ensure all earth moving activities are observed for areas being monitored. This includes all grubbing, grading and trenching onsite and for all offsite improvements. Inspections will vary based on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of inspections will be determined and directed by the Project Archaeologist.

Cultural Sensitivity Training - The Project Archaeologist and a representative designated by the Tribe shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to provide Cultural Sensitivity Training for all construction personnel. Training will include a brief review of the cultural sensitivity of the Project and the surrounding area; the areas to be avoided during grading activities; what resources could potentially be identified during earthmoving activities; the requirements of the monitoring program; the protocols that apply in the event unanticipated cultural resources are identified, including who to contact and appropriate avoidance measures until the find(s) can be properly evaluated; and any other appropriate

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

protocols. This is a mandatory training and all construction personnel must attend prior to beginning work on the project site. A sign-in sheet for attendees of this training shall be included in the Phase IV Monitoring Report.

Unanticipated Resources - In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the Archaeological and/or Tribal Monitor(s) shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The Project Archaeologist, in consultation with the Tribal monitor, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The County Archaeologist must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. Further, before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, the artifacts shall be recovered and features recorded using professional archaeological methods. The Project Archaeologist shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field and the monitored grading can proceed.

Artifact Disposition- the landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources that are unearthed on the Project property during any ground-disturbing activities, including previous investigations and/or Phase III data recovery.

Historic Resources- all historic archaeological materials recovered during the archaeological investigations (this includes collections made during an earlier project, such as testing of archaeological sites that took place years ago), shall be curated at the Western Science Center, a Riverside County curation facility that meets State Resources Department Office of Historic Preservation Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Resources ensuring access and use pursuant to the Guidelines

Prehistoric resources- This will be accomplished by one of the following processes.

1. on-site, with a fully executed reburial agreement with the consulting Native American tribe(s) or band(s). This shall include measures and provisions to protect the reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing, analysis and special studies have been completed on the cultural resources. Details of contents and location of the reburial shall be included in the Phase IV Report.

or

2. 2. Curation at a Riverside County Curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore will be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers and tribal members for further study. The collection and associated records shall be transferred, including title, and are to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.

The Professional Archaeologist may submit a detailed letter to the County of Riverside during grading requesting a modification to the monitoring program if circumstances are encountered that reduce the need for monitoring

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

ENERGY Would the project:

10. Energy Impacts

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

b) Conflict with or obstruct a State or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Climate Action Plan ("CAP"), Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

b) The County has not adopted any energy conservation plans, nor do any State or Federal energy conservation plans apply to the project site. There is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project directly or indirectly:

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

a) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, Geologist Comments, Geology Report

Findings of Fact:

a) According to RCLIS (GIS database), the proposed project is not located within a fault zone. Based on the review of aerial photos, site mapping and literature research, there is no evidence of active faults

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

crossing trending toward the subject site. California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to new development and construction will minimize the potential for structural failure or loss of life during earthquakes by ensuring that structures are constructed pursuant to applicable seismic design criteria for the region. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

12. Liquefaction Potential Zone

a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction," Geology Report

Findings of Fact:

a) According to RCLIS (GIS database) there is no potential for this site to be affected by seismically induced liquefaction is considered low. No impacts are anticipated. This site is not located in a flood zone. The site is not located within 1/2 mile of a fault. Less than significant impacts are considered.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

13. Ground-shaking Zone

a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), Geology Report

Findings of Fact:

a) Strong ground shaking can be expected at the site, as well as virtually all of southern California, during moderate to severe earthquakes in this general region. Potential impacts from groundshaking can be lessened to a level of insignificance through compliance with the current California Building Code Seismic Design requirements and the building permit review process. Such compliance shall be required by Riverside County Ordinance. This requirement is not considered unique mitigation for CEQA purposes. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact with regard to ground shaking.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

14. Landslide Risk

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

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5, the project is located in an area with slopes of than 15-25%. As the project site does not consist of any rocky terrain, there is no potential for rockfall hazards. Additionally, it is likely that the Project site would become more stable as a result of the grading activities. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

15. Ground Subsidence

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

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 "Documented Subsidence Areas Map," Geology Report

Findings of Fact:

a) According to RCLIS (GIS database), the proposed project is not located in a susceptible subsistence area. Additionally, with conformance with the California Building Code any potential for ground subsidence would be minimized to a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

16. Other Geologic Hazards

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

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

Source(s): On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Geology Report

Findings of Fact:

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

a) The project site is not located near any large bodies of water or in a known volcanic area; therefore, the project site is not subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

17. Slopes	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riv. Co. 800-Scale Slope Maps, Project Application Materials, Slope Stability Report

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed Project is for grading activity which would change topography or ground surface relief features. Approximately 5,317 cubic yards of dirt will alter the site's natural topography or ground surface relief features. No dirt will be brought in or removed from the site. Additionally the incorporation of Best Management Practices would ensure that there would be a less than significant impact related to the proposed grading activities. The existing topography on the site slopes in general to the southwest at an average gradient of 10 to 35 percent. The proposed site grading will not change that appreciably, and will be a less than significant Impact.

b) No slopes with a slope ratio greater than two to one (2:1) (horizontal run: vertical rise) are proposed. Therefore there would be a less than significant impact.

c) Under existing conditions, the Project site comprises undeveloped land with no existing uses that require wastewater treatment. Thus, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in grading that affects or negates any active subsurface sewage disposal systems, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

18. Soils	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code (2019), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection, Soils Report

Findings of Fact:

a) The development of the site could result in the loss of topsoil from grading activities, but not in a manner that will result in significant amounts of soil erosion. Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) through preparation and submittal of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will reduce the impact to below a level of significance. Some BMPs include the use of sediment filters and gravel bags to prevent water run-off and soil erosion during construction activity. BMPs as administered in the SWPPP by a qualified SWPP Designer (QSD) are required pursuant to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements and are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Impacts will be less than significant.

b) The project may be located on expansive soil; however, California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining all structures will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As IBC requirements are applicable to all structures they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

c) The project will not result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems. No impact will occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. No. 460, Article XV & Ord. No. 484

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located within an area of Moderate Wind Erodibility rating. The General Plan, Safety Element Policy for Wind Erosion requires buildings and structures to be designed to resist wind loads which are covered by the California Building Code. With such compliance, the project will not result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site. The project will have a less than significant impact.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project:

20. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Climate Action Plan ("CAP"), Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The Planning Department does not require a greenhouse gas numerical analysis for small projects that would not contribute cumulatively significant amounts of exhaust emissions or generate cumulatively considerable levels of GHGs from fuel combustion or involve substantial water and electricity demands. The proposed project is grading one lot for one single family home and a detached garage intended to implement on a previously approved residential lot. Approval of this grading plan does not expressly authorize the construction of any buildings; however, construction of a single family residence is likely to occur thereafter. This application is for grading only. Additionally, the type of small-scale residential development that could follow this grading project would not generate enough GHG emissions from its construction or operation to be deemed cumulatively significant sufficient to warrant quantitative or qualitative GHG analysis, nor would the grading proposed by this application. More specifically, the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) proposed a very aggressive 900 metric tons per year of the GHG emissions threshold for residential and commercial projects. The intent of the 900-ton threshold is to capture 90% of all new residential and commercial development projects. CAPCOA's threshold was based on the amount of GHG emissions associated with 50 single family residential units, which accounts for 84% of the projects of California. The 900-ton threshold would also correspond to apartments/condominiums of 70 units, office projects of approximately 35,000 square feet, retail projects of 11,000 square feet, and supermarkets of 6,300 square feet, but would exclude smaller residential developments, offices and retail stores from having to quantify and mitigate GHG emissions under CEQA. Thus the project's contribution to GHG emissions is far below the 900-ton threshold that might otherwise trigger GHG analysis according to CAPCOA's model. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:

21. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<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
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter (1/4) mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Typical of construction projects, project equipment would use diesel fuel and other common petroleum-based products, but not in quantities that would be considered beyond that of any standard construction project and not of the quantities that would present any danger to the public. All materials would be transported and used in accordance with standard practices and regulations. The project is a small residential development that is not anticipated to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and would not routinely be transporting, using or disposing hazardous materials. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

b) The proposed project is not anticipated to result in a release of hazardous materials into the environment. However, during the short-term period of project construction, there is the possibility of accidental release of hazardous substances such as spilling of petroleum-based fuels used for construction equipment. The level of risk associated with the accidental release of hazardous substances is not considered significant due to the small volume and low concentration of hazardous materials utilized during construction. The contractor would be required to use standard construction controls, abide by standard regulations, and safety procedures, which would avoid and minimize the potential for accidental release of such substances into the environment. Because of the low chance that a hazardous substance spill would occur and standard construction practices would be implemented such that any materials released are appropriately contained and remediated as required by local, state, and federal law, impacts are not anticipated and are considered to be less than significant.

c) The proposed project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. The project allows for adequate emergency access. Due to the relatively small size of the development project within an existing residential community, and that the development is consistent with the land uses planned for in the Riverside County's General Plan Land Use Element, no impact would occur.

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

d) There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site or in the project vicinity. Also, the proposed project does not propose the transportation of substantial amounts of hazardous materials (refer to finding of fact 20a). Therefore, there is no impact.

e) The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. A search on the EnviroStor search engine on the California Department of Toxic Substance Control's website (accessed on December 14, 2020) revealed that no hazardous materials issue records were found on the project site (APN 915-220-049).¹ Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

22. Airports				
a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two (2) miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-20 "Airport Locations," GIS database

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site is not located within an Airport Master Plan; therefore will not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan. Therefore, there is no impact.
- b) The project site is not located within an Airport Master Plan or Airport Influence Area (AIA); therefore will not require to be reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission. Therefore there is no impact.
- c-d) The project site is not located within two miles of any airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore the project will not create a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area in reference to a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:				
23. Water Quality Impacts				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk the release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "Special Flood Hazard Areas," Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

- a) The grading plan incorporates Best Management Practices (BMP's) to minimize and eliminate any type of surface runoff on- or off-site. Additionally, stormwater and waste discharge will be managed via conformance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbook. Therefore, the proposed Project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. There would be a less than significant impact.
- b) The proposed Project is simply for grading activity and will not interfere with any groundwater supply. Due to the relatively small nature of the proposed residential development, it is not anticipated that the project would substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater

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

recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Therefore, there would be no impact.

c) As indicated in the WQMP, drainage from the proposed development is routed to join existing drainage patterns. The grading plan incorporates BMP's to minimize and eliminate any substantial surface on-site and across property lines. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. There would be a less than significant impact.

d) The proposed Project incorporates BMP's to minimize and eliminate the amount of surface runoff on-site and across property lines, and includes measures to avoid any type of pollution runoff. The proposed Project would not contribute to erosion or siltation on or off site. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

e) The proposed Project incorporates BMP's to minimize and eliminate the amount of surface runoff on-site and across property lines, and includes measures to avoid any type of pollution runoff. The proposed Project would not substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

f) During the construction and grading phase of development, the project has the potential to contribute to additional polluted runoff water. However, the project will not exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. The Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan created for the lot is required to provide adequate drainage facilities. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant

f) The proposed Project incorporates BMP's to minimize and eliminate the amount of surface runoff on-site and across property lines, and includes measures to avoid any type of pollution runoff. The proposed Project would not substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

g-h) As indicated in General Plan Figure S-9, the Project site is not located in an area with the potential for flood hazards. Therefore, there would be no impact.

i) The proposed grading plan includes design elements to manage any potential excess or concentrated drainage on-site or at an approved drainage facility. Additionally, any drainage across the property line would not be exceeding that which existed prior to grading. No Alternative compliance measures are required for this project. Therefore, there will be a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project:

24. Land Use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The project proposes grading that is consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation of Rural Residential (RR). Therefore, there would be no impact.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
25. Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Potentially expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-6 "Mineral Resources Area"

Findings of Fact:

a) The project area has not been used for mining. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the state that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State. Therefore, there is no impact.

b) The proposed project site has not been used for mineral resources; therefore, the project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

c) Surrounding the project site are residential homes on large lots and vacant land. There are no existing surface mines surrounding the project site; therefore, the project will be compatible with the surrounding uses and will not be located adjacent to a State classified, designated area, or existing surface mine. Therefore, there is no impact.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

NOISE Would the project result in:				
26. Airport Noise				
a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two (2) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-20 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project site is not located within an Airport Influence Area; therefore, the project will not expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels related to air traffic. Therefore, there will be no impact.

b) The proposed project site is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip; therefore the project will not expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels. Therefore there will be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

27. Noise Effects by the Project				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Table N-1 ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure"), Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

a-b) Short-term construction-related noise impacts will occur during project grading. The construction related activities will be required to adhere to the Riverside County noise standards. With the construction and grading activities occurring within one-quarter mile of an occupied residence, no construction activities shall be undertaken between the hours of 6:00pm and 6:00am during the months of June through September and between the hours of 6:00pm and 7:00am during the months of October through May. All construction vehicles, equipment fixed or mobile shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers. During construction, best efforts will be made to locate stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas as far as practical from existing residential dwellings. This is a standard policy and is, therefore, not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

28. Paleontological Resources

a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity," Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program ("PRIMP") Report

Findings of Fact:

a) According to RCLIS (GIS database) the project site has a low potential for paleontological sensitivity. As such, Paleontological monitoring is not required and the project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:

29. Housing

a) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or 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) Induce substantial unplanned 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(s): Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element

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

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed project site is currently vacant; thus, the proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, therefore there is no impact.
- b) The proposed project will not create permanent employment opportunities; therefore, it will not create a demand for additional housing, therefore there is no impact.
- c) The project proposes grading for one existing single family residential parcel and will not increase the population of the area beyond that which was already accounted for when the property was subdivided, therefore there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is 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 following public services:

30. Fire Services

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact:

The project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities. As such, this project will not cause the construction that could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

31. Sheriff Services

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

The project is the grading of a pad on a vacant lot. Additionally, the project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government

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

facilities. As such, this project will not cause the construction that could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

32. Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source(s): School District correspondence, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

The subject parcel is currently vacant and the project consists of grading of dirt. As such, the proposed project will not displace any existing housing or residents, nor will it add any new housing, residents or habitable structures to the area. With no habitable structures proposed, the resultant grading permit will not generate any new students or otherwise affect the demand for schools in the area. It will also not necessitate the provision of new or expanded schools or other educational facilities. For these reasons, this project will have no impact on schools.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

33. Libraries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

The subject parcel is currently vacant and the project consists of grading of dirt. As such, the proposed project will not displace any existing housing or residents, nor will it add any new housing, residents or habitable structures to the area. With no habitable structures proposed, the resultant grading permit will not generate any new students or otherwise affect the demand for schools in the area. It will also not necessitate the provision of new or expanded schools or other educational facilities. For these reasons, this project will have no impact on libraries.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

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

Findings of Fact:

The project will not create a significant additional need for additional health services. However, these types of services are normally user fee or tax-supported services. No shortage in the provision of health care service is expected as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project will not have a significant on health services and no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

RECREATION Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
35. Parks and Recreation				
a) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

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

b) The project proposes only grading activities. Recreational opportunities for the grading equipment operators are not considered important enough to qualify for a finding of significance. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

c) The residential development project would not directly or indirectly induce significant population growth. The project may add additional people who might use existing parks and recreational facilities within the project area. The project would be required to comply with Riverside County regulations in regards to payment of park fees (if any). Quimby fees are not due to prior to grading, thus, the project will not impact the need for fees to be paid. Thus, impacts would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

36. Recreational Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Include the construction or expansion of a trail system?				

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure C-6 Trails and Bikeway System

Findings of Fact:

The project does not propose a trail system, nor is the project required to construct or expand any of the existing trail systems within the project vicinity. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

TRANSPORTATION Would the project:				
37. Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?				
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric 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"/>
d) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project would be a residential development, which would not add a significant amount of traffic to the existing circulation system. The project is not expected to result in a substantial increase in vehicle trips and congestion to the areas circulation system because the density of development is consistent with the General Plan. The project would be reviewed for consistency with all applicable County plans and would be required to comply with State and County design regulations. Impacts are considered less than significant.

b) The proposed project is not anticipated to exceed either individually or cumulatively any level of service standard established by the County. Implementation of the project would result in negligible increases in traffic volumes on area roadways, but would not individually result in an excess of a County level of service. To address Vehicle Miles Traveled, according to the State of California Office of Planning and Research Technical Advisory On Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, projects

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

that generate or attract fewer than 110 vehicle trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. A single family residence would be anticipated to generate well below 110 vehicle trips per day. Therefore, the project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Less than significant impacts would occur.

c) The County's Transportation Department would review and approve the private driveway design. Project implementation would not result in substantial hazards to vehicular traffic. Less than significant impacts would occur in this regard.

d) The development for residential use is considered a minimal development that is consistent with the County's General Plan. This type of development is typical and not out of the ordinary for the area. Implementation of the project would not cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads in the vicinity of the project and a less than significant would occur.

e) The project would not cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction because all equipment and materials needed for construction would be staged within the project site. Construction vehicles accessing the site would be minimal and would not cause traffic issues for the current vicinity circulation system. A less than significant area circulation impact would occur during project construction.

f) Prior to construction, the project would be subject to review by the County's Fire and Sheriff Departments to assure that adequate emergency access is provided. The County's standard review procedures prior to issuance of grading permits would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

38. Bike Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Include the construction or expansion of a bike system or bike lanes?				

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

The project is not located adjacent to or nearby any designated bike trails. The project does not propose a bicycle trail system or bike lanes, nor is the project required to construct or expand any of the existing bike trail/lane systems within the project vicinity. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is:

39. Tribal Cultural Resources

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? (In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): County Archaeologist, AB52 Tribal Consultation

Findings of Fact:

a – b) Changes in the California Environmental Quality Act, effective July 2015, require that the County address a new category of cultural resources – tribal cultural resources – not previously included within the law’s purview. Tribal Cultural Resources are those resources with inherent tribal values that are difficult to identify through the same means as archaeological resources. These resources can be identified and understood through direct consultation with the tribes who attach tribal value to the resource. Tribal cultural resources may include Native American archaeological sites, but they may also include other types of resources such as cultural landscapes or sacred places. The appropriate treatment of tribal cultural resources is determined through consultation with tribes.

In compliance with Assembly Bill 52 (AB52), notices regarding this project were mailed to all requesting tribes on October 19, 2020.

No response was received from the Cahuilla Band of Indians, Pala Band of Mission Indians, or Rincon Band . The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians deferred to the Pechanga Band. Consultations were requested by the Pechanga Band.

The Temecula Band of Luiseño Indians (Pechanga) requested consultation in a letter dated October 27, 2020. The project cultural report was provided to Pechanga on November 20, 2020; During a meeting held on December 02, 2020 this project was discussed. Pechanga recommended that an archaeologist and a tribal monitor be present during ground disturbing activities. The band also requested that if any cultural resources are identified during ground disturbing, that they be reburied on the property.

On December 07, 2020 the conditions of approval were sent to the tribe. Mitigation measures were recommended that would provide for a Native American monitor to be present during grading for this

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

parcel so that in the event any unanticipated tribal cultural resources are identified they will be handled in a culturally appropriate manner.

No specific tribal cultural resources were identified by the consulting tribes however the project has been conditioned for a Native American monitor to be present during ground disturbance. With the inclusion of these conditions of approval impacts to previously unidentified Tribal Cultural Resources would be less than significant.

TCR-1

Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the developer/permit applicant shall enter into an agreement with the consulting tribe(s) for a Native American Monitor.

The Native American Monitor(s) shall be on-site during all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of each portion of the project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading and trenching. In conjunction with the Archaeological Monitor(s), the Native American Monitor(s) shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and potential recovery of cultural resources.

The developer/permit applicant shall submit a fully executed copy of the agreement to the County Archaeologist to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Archaeologist shall clear this condition.

This agreement shall not modify any condition of approval or mitigation measure.

Mitigation: Mitigation pursuant to the above Condition of Approval (COA).

Monitoring: Monitoring of initial grading activities by Native American Monitor(s) and verifications of agreement by County Archaeologist

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:				
40. Water				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage systems, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Project Application Materials, Water Company

Findings of Fact:

a) Storm water drainage will follow existing patterns after being treated with BMP's required by compliance with NPDES. The project will ultimately construct a residential structure which is not anticipated to require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage systems. The project would obtain potable water from Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD). No wastewater facility would be significantly impacted with the future residential use. The residential use would not create significant impervious surfaces that would generate the need for a storm water drainage system and storm flows would utilize the existing storm water

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

facilities/drainage system within the surrounding community. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

b) The proposed project is served by the Eastern Municipal Water District. It is anticipated that the project will have sufficient water supplies available and would not require new or expanded entitlements to serve the project. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

41. Sewer

a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, whereby the construction or relocation 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(s): Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed project proposes grading activities that would accommodate a future residential use. Compliance with the County of Riverside and EMWD regulations would reduce sewer impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

42. Solid Waste

a) Generate solid waste in excess of State or Local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

b) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence

Findings of Fact:

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

a-b) The project proposes grading activities which will not generate any waste materials. The project would be considered a small residential development that would not generate significant waste. Project implementation would not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Ultimate development of the project site will generate a less than significant impact to solid waste disposal needs. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

43. Utilities

Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?

a) Electricity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Project Application Materials, Utility Companies

Findings of Fact:

a-f) The project will not require or result in the construction of new community utilities or the expansion of existing community utility facilities. Implementation of the project will result in a slight incremental system capacity demand for energy systems, communication systems, street lighting systems, maintenance of public facilities, including roads and potentially other governmental services. These impacts are considered less than significant based on the availability of existing public utilities that support the project area. The applicant shall make arrangements with each utility provider to ensure each residential building is connected to the appropriate utilities. Thus, impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

WILDFIRE If located in or near a State Responsibility Area ("SRA"), lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zone, or other hazardous fire areas that may be designated by the Fire Chief, would the project:

44. Wildfire Impacts				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project	<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
occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 “Wildfire Susceptibility”, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project would be served by an existing circulation system that provides access to the project site and facilitates vehicular circulation throughout the project area in accordance with Riverside County and State standards. The Riverside County Sheriff’s Department, California Highway Patrol, and other cooperating law enforcement agencies have primary responsibility for evacuations. These agencies work together to assess fire behavior and spread, which ultimately influence evacuation decisions. Evacuation routes are generally identified by fire protection and law enforcement personnel, are determined based on the location and extent of the incident, and include as many predesignated transportation routes as possible. Depending on the nature of the emergency requiring evacuation, it is anticipated that the majority of the project area residents would exit the project area via the existing roadway circulation system. Project implementation would not impair access to these roadways should an evacuation be required. It is not anticipated that the project would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

b) The project would be subject to compliance with the 2019 California Building Code (or the most current version) and the 2019 edition of the California Fire Code (Part 9 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations). Compliance with these regulations would reduce impacts due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire would be considered less than significant.

c) Implementation of the proposed project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. As discussed above, the project would be required to comply with existing regulations that help reduce fire risks and does not propose power lines, etc. Impacts are considered less than significant.

d) Implementation of the proposed project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope

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

instability, or drainage changes. The project does not propose any components that would create significant risks due to flooding, post-fire slope instability or drainage changes. Impacts are considered less than significant.

e) Project implementation would not expose people or structures either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires because it would be required to comply with State and County regulations regarding fire risk reduction. Compliance with development fire regulations would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Does the Project:

45. 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, substantially 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?

Source(s): Staff Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially 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.

46. Have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects and probable future projects)?

Source(s): Staff Review, Project Application Materials

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

47. Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Source(s): Staff Review, Project Application Materials

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 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:

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

Location: County of Riverside Planning Department
 4080 Lemon Street 12th Floor
 Riverside, CA 92501

Revised: 2/25/2021 10:37 AM
 Y:\Planning Master Forms\Templates\CEQA Forms\EA-IS_Template.docx

i
https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?CMD=search&ocieerp=&HWMP=False&business_name=&main_street_name=&city=&zip=&county=&censustract=&case_number=&apn=245270019&Search=Get+Report