

## **Table of Contents**

This document serves as the Supplemental Response to Comments and Complete Errata for GPA No. 1122, EIR No. 548, CZ No. 7902, and Ordinance No. 348.4840. This document, along with Draft EIR No. 548 and Draft Final EIR No. 548, serves as the proposed Final EIR for the project. The comments addressed in this Supplemental Response to Comments document were submitted as written and spoken testimony during the Planning Commission public hearing process. The Planning Commission hearing was held on August 3, 2016.

Section 1: Introduction

Section 2: Written Comments and Responses

Section 3: Oral Comments and Responses

Section 4: Complete Errata

# Section 1: Introduction

---

*Page Intentionally Left Blank*

## Introduction

The County of Riverside has prepared the General Plan 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Update that consist of a number of components. These components include General Plan Amendment No. 1122, Ordinance No. 348.4840, Change of Zone No. 7902, and Environmental Impact Report No. 548 (project).

The Planning Commission held the first Public Hearing for the project on August 3, 2016 at the City of Perris Council Chambers. During the Public Hearing process, written and oral testimony was presented to the Planning Commission. County staff has compiled responses to the submitted written and oral comments.

The following document presents the abovementioned written and oral comments received during the Planning Commission Public Hearings. Oral comments were received from Hearing attendees, while written comments were received from interested individuals and organizations. Public testimony received during the Planning Commission Hearing and their respective responses are included in the following document. Further, the document ends with Supplemental Errata that has been implemented as a result of public testimony and further staff research during the hearing process.

The document sections include:

- Section 1: Introduction
- Section 2: Written Comments and Responses
- Section 3: Oral Comments and Responses
- Section 4: Supplemental Errata

The Section 4 Complete Errata is included for any changes that were made to the project as a result of comments received during the Public Hearing process. The changes to project do not affect the overall policies and conclusions of GPA No. 1122 (or the environmental analysis provided in EIR No. 548), and instead represent changes to the General Plan that provide clarification, amplification and/or “insignificant modifications” as needed as a result of public comments on the General Plan.

The above noted clarifications and corrections do not warrant recirculation of EIR No. 548 pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15088.5. As set forth in Section 5, none of the Errata to the General Plan or EIR reflect a new significant environmental impact, a “substantial increase” in the severity of an environmental impact for which mitigation is not proposed, or a new feasible alternative or mitigation measure that would clearly lessen significant environmental impacts but is not adopted, nor do the Errata reflect a “fundamentally flawed” or “conclusory” EIR.

In order to clearly display all of the changes that have been made during the Housing Element update process, the document text has been formatted to show changes made in each step of the process. This includes:

- Black Text: General Plan text prior to GPA No. 1122 is noted in black text.

- Red Text: Textual changes proposed as part of prior to the release of the Draft EIR in April 2016 are noted in red text.
- Green Text: Textual changes made to the documents after the completion of the draft EIR 45-day public review period are noted in green text.
- Orange Text: Textual changes made to the documents during the Planning Commission hearing process are noted in orange text.

The color coding of the edits allows the reader to distinguish more clearly between the original General Plan text, and proposed changes to the project as it is taken through the hearing process. Added or modified text is shown by italicizing (*example*) while deleted text is shown by striking (~~example~~).

The revisions incorporated into the project as a result of the Planning Commission Public Hearing are described in Section 4 of this document.

Refer to Table 1, *Riverside County Planning Commission Comment and Response Matrix*, for a summary of all comments received during the public hearing process as well as staff's response.

## Planning Commission Public Comments and Responses Matrix, October 5, 2016

District	Comment Number	Commenter	Comments	Response
<u>Countywide</u>				
All	5	Endangered Habitats League	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Silver stated that cities should be accommodating the bulk of the RHNA due to proximity of infrastructure but recognizes the need for housing for all incomes within the County.</li> <li>Mr. Silver noted three questions related to the Housing Element update:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the proposed MUA/HHDR units be built out/how will market force and/or financial incentives dictate development?</li> <li>Do the locations represent good planning/are units close to infrastructure/will developments be walkable/provide activities, jobs and services?</li> <li>Would the proposal reduce VMT/how does the project relate to the CAP?</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All cities within the County are required to accommodate additional units through their respective RHNA. SCAG develops a RHNA for counties and cities throughout southern California. Each City within the County also must accommodate additional housing units to meet their RHNA.</li> <li>County staff has reviewed the submitted questions and has provided the following responses:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The units accommodated by the new HHDR/MUA zones will be developed as market forces dictate. It is anticipated that units will be developed within the proposed neighborhoods over an extended period of time. The updated Housing Element does allow projects to qualify for various grant-based funding mechanisms that may help accommodate future growth.</li> <li>The proposed neighborhood sites were chosen through an exhaustive process that evaluated sites based on a number of criteria, including the availability of local community-supportive facilities and services, availability of intra- and interregional transportation facilities, availability of supportive on-site and site-edge land use and environmental characteristics, availability of primary on-site infrastructure (roads, sewer, and water), and flexibility in individual site development options. While not all sites contain all of these features, the County selected sites that contain as many of these features as possible while spreading development throughout the county to provide potential future housing options throughout Riverside County. For further information on</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

**Planning Commission Public Comments and Responses Matrix, October 5, 2016**

				<p>site selection, refer to page H-125 of the Housing Element.</p> <p>3. Refer to the response above. Staff developed sites based on a number of criteria, including proximity to transit locations. The proposed neighborhoods would provide additional density for development and mixed use development which does encourage trip reduction due to the proximity of services. For discussion regarding the traffic/transportation impacts of the proposed project, refer to Section 3.16 (Transportation/Traffic) of EIR No. 548. In regards to the CAP, the project furthers the goal transit-oriented development (See CAP Appendix E1, Implementation Measure IM-T3) and would encourage the development of housing and commercial uses that allow for a variety of transportation modes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Staff do not recommend any changes to the project as a result of this comment.</u></li> </ul>
ALL	7	Sierra Club San Geronio Chapter/San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commenter noted a number of concerns related to the potential environmental impacts associated with the project, including the use of a mid-range population projection, GHG impacts, Air quality impacts, health risk impacts, the San Jacinto Wildlife Area/biological resources, farmland, leapfrog development/utility and service system extensions, and flooding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff has provided formal responses to comments in the Written Comments and Responses (Section 2) in this document. Further, a number of the comments were addressed Final EIR No. 548 Response to Comments document. Specific citations have been provided below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In regards to the use of a mid-range population projection method for the analysis within EIR No. 548, refer to FEIR No. 548 Response to Comments, Response 12.2.</li> <li>2. In regards to GHG mitigation measures and potential GHG impacts, refer to FEIR No. 548 Response to Comments, Response 12.10.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Planning Commission Public Comments and Responses Matrix, October 5, 2016**

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. In regards to potential air quality impacts and health risks associated with mobile source pollutants, refer to FEIR No. 548 Response to Comments, Response 12.11.</li> <li>4. In regards to biological resources, and the San Jacinto Wildlife Area, refer to FEIR No. 548 Response to Comments, Responses 10.2 through 10.4, as well as Response 12.5 and 12.6.</li> <li>5. In Regards to potential impacts to farmland, refer to FEIR No. 548 Response to Comments, Response 12.10</li> <li>6. In regards to the location of proposed communities, and future service systems, refer to FEIR No. 548 Response to Comments, Response 18.13.</li> <li>7. In regards to Flooding and Dam Inundation, refer to FEIR No. 548 Response to Comments, Response 15.2.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Staff do no recommend any changes to the project as a result of this comment.</u></li> </ul>
<b>ALL</b>	<b>10</b>	Joel Morse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Morse recommended minor changes to the zoning code text, as well as minor policy changes to the General Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff has reviewed the recommended changes to the zoning code, including further definition or private open space requirements and the removal of text related to neighborhood viability per Mr. Morse's comments. Staff has included the recommended changes in the Supplemental Errata document attached to this report.</li> <li>• Staff has reviewed the recommended policy changes submitted by Mr. Morse related to MUA's not developed for residential uses. Staff has included the recommended changes in the Supplemental Errata document attached to this report.</li> <li>• Staff has reviewed Mr. Morse's comments regarding further definition of park credits. While these comments are noted, these would be best incorporated in a future planning effort due to the effort and research required.</li> </ul>



## Planning Commission Public Comments and Responses Matrix, October 5, 2016

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Staff recommends the incorporation of Mr. Morse's comments as outlined above.</u></li> </ul>
ALL	11	Colorado River Indian Tribes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Colorado River Indian Tribes did not have specific comments for the proposed project, and defer to other tribes in the County.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Staff do not recommend any changes to the project as a result of this comment.</u></li> </ul>
ALL	N/A	Mariela Magana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Magana noted a number of concerns related to air quality, health impact, and environmental justice issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff reviewed Ms. Magana's testimony, and have provided a formal response in the Oral Comments section of this document.</li> <li>• <u>Staff do not recommend any changes to the project as a result of this comment.</u></li> </ul>
ALL	N/A	Michelle Hasson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Hasson noted concerns related to Ozone, and other potential air quality issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff reviewed Ms. Hasson's testimony, and have provided a formal response in the Oral Comments section of this document.</li> <li>• <u>Staff do not recommend any changes to the project as a result of this comment.</u></li> </ul>
ALL	N/A	Josh Bougeois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Bougeois reiterated concerns with the EIR and Housing Element Update, as stated in his Final EIR Comment Letter.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff reviewed Mr. Bougeois' testimony, and have provided a formal response in the Oral Comments section of this document. Staff also provided formal comments included as Response to Comments, Response 13 of the Final EIR.</li> <li>• <u>Staff do not recommend any changes to the project as a result of this comment.</u></li> </ul>
ALL	N/A	C. Deitemeyer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Deitemeyer filled out a speaker card as opposed to the project, but declined to speak.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Staff do not recommend any changes to the project as a result of this comment.</u></li> </ul>
ALL	N/A	Theodore Gaines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Gaines declined his opportunity to provide comment on the proposed project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Staff do not recommend any changes to the project as a result of this comment.</u></li> </ul>
<b>District 1</b>				

**Planning Commission Public Comments and Responses Matrix, October 5, 2016**

<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	Janlee Watson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Watson noted questions regarding the Lee Lake Neighborhoods included in the project, and when they were added into the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Lee Lake Neighborhoods were included in the original proposed neighborhoods that were presented during the 2015 community workshops. The neighborhoods were illustrated online on the County Planning Department website.</li> <li><u>Staff has reviewed Temescal Valley residents' concerns related to the proposed Lee Lake Communities, and proposes redesignation of a portion of the Lee Lake Community as MUA as opposed to HHDR as included in the Project currently. These changes have been included in the Post Production Land Use Designation Change attachment to the Staff Report.</u></li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	Emanuel Lin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Lin noted support for the proposed project, and requested further information regarding the potential future uses that could be located on his property that is located along Belamo Ln in the Mead Valley Area Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>CONTEXT:</b> Mr. Lin owns a 10-acre parcel (APN: 326-250-011) located in the Mead Valley Area Plan. Under the propose Project, the site would be redesignated from an MDR LUD to an MUA Land use designation.</li> <li>County staff provided resources to Mr. Lin regarding future uses that would be allowable in the MUA zone, and directed Mr. Lin to the appropriate resources for his remaining questions that were outside of the scope of the project.</li> <li><u>Staff do not recommend any changes to the project as a result of this comment.</u></li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>N/A</b>	Jerry Sincich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Sincich noted a number of concerns related to potential hazards within the Lee Lake Community, and the potential development of solely HHDR development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff have noted Mr. Sincich's concerns, and have addressed his concerns related to hazards in the Oral Comments section of this document.</li> <li><u>Staff has reviewed Temescal Valley residents' concerns related to the proposed Lee Lake Communities, and proposes redesignation of a portion of the Lee Lake Community as MUA as opposed to HHDR as included in the Project currently. These changes have been included in the Post Production Land Use Designation Change attachment to the Staff Report.</u></li> </ul>
<b>District 2</b>				

## Planning Commission Public Comments and Responses Matrix, October 5, 2016

2	6	Mission Pacific Land Company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Mission Pacific Land Company noted opposition to the proposed project due to a tentative tract map (TTM 29315, Approved in 2004) that consists of 96 acres of MDR development located in the proposed Lakeview Nuevo Area Plan Lakeview Town Center.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>CONTEXT:</b> The Lakeview Town Center consists of seven neighborhoods, of which neighborhoods 1-4 contain/are adjacent to the existing 96 acres within TTM 29315. TTM 29315 proposed development consistent with the MDR land use designation, and does not include proposed HHDR development as included in the MUA (25% HHDR requirement).</li> <li>The concerns noted by the Mission Pacific Land Company will be presented to the Planning Commission for consideration. It should be noted that the project does allow for the development of the majority of the approved TTM, and would allow for increased density development on a portion of the site.</li> <li><u>Staff recommends the removal of the TTM 29315 from the proposed project. This change is included in the post production land use change table, appended to the October 5, 2016 staff report.</u></li> </ul>
2	9	Highgrove Property Owner, LLC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Highgrove Property Owner, LLC noted objection to the proposed project due to a tentative tract map (TTM 28957) located in Neighborhood 1 of the High Grove Town Center.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The noted property has been reviewed by staff.</li> <li><u>Staff recommends the removal of the TTM 28957 property from the proposed project. Staff, upon reviewing TTM 28957, also recommends the removal of TTM 36668, which is also located in neighborhood 1 of the High Grove Town Center. This change is included in the post production land use change table, appended to the October 5, 2016 staff report.</u></li> </ul>
<b>District 3</b>				
3	1	Ray Borel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Borel noted concerns and requested further information regarding the redesignation of a portion of his parcel located in the Southwest Area Plan, at the intersection of Borel Rd. and Allen Rd.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>CONTEXT:</b> Mr. Borel's parcel, which is approximately 109 acres, located in Neighborhood 2 of the French Valley Airport (Refer to EIR Exhibit 4.6-1). The existing LUD on the site is MDR, under the proposed project an 8.92 acre portion of the site would be designated as MUA, with the remaining 100 acres remaining as MDR.</li> </ul>

**Planning Commission Public Comments and Responses Matrix, October 5, 2016**

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During public testimony, Mr. Borel noted that his property is subject to an agricultural preserve, which may conflict with the proposed project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff responded to Mr. Borel, outlining the rationale for the proposed LUD on his parcel, and why his parcel was not completed redesignated (Refer to email response from Bill Gayk dated July 11, 2016). Generally, due to the size of the site is was not feasible to redesignate the site in its entirety, as such the MUA designation was use to provide a variety of development options that would work in conjunction with the existing MDR LUD.</li> <li><u>Staff reviewed Mr. Borel's comments, and after consideration of his existing agricultural preserve recommend the removal of the French Valley Airport Vicinity Neighborhoods from the proposed project.</u></li> </ul>
3	2	Aeonard Borel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Borel noted concerns and requested further information regarding the Neighborhood 1 and Neighborhood 2 parcels at the intersection of Borel Rd. and Allen Rd.</li> <li>Mr. Borel requested further information on the rationale for the acreages designated between the area plans, and why a larger acreage was not designated under the proposed project in the SWAP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>CONTEXT:</b> See Ray Borel response above.</li> <li>In regards to the proposed acreage of the Neighborhoods, in comparison to proposed neighborhoods in other area plans, due to the location of the site and the surrounding development, staff felt that a small MUA site best fit the community need and is well suited to the surrounding infrastructure in the community. Small site have been included in a number of areas outside of Southwest Area Plan, including the Elsinore and Mead Valley Area Plans.</li> </ul> <p>In the event that the Borel family would like to expand the MUA in the future, a General Plan amendment could be completed to change land use designation on the remainder of the parcel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Staff reviewed Mr. Borel's comments, and after consideration of his existing agricultural preserve recommend the removal of the French Valley Airport Vicinity Neighborhoods from the proposed project.</u></li> </ul>

**Planning Commission Public Comments and Responses Matrix, October 5, 2016**

3	3	Annie Borel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Borel requested a map denoting the changes associated with the proposed Project for the property located at intersection of Borel Rd. and Allen Rd.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>CONTEXT:</b> See Ray Borel response above.</li> <li>Staff provided the requested map to Ms. Borel on July 18, 2016.</li> <li>Staff reviewed Ms. Borel's comments, and after consideration of his existing agricultural preserve recommend the removal of the French Valley Airport Vicinity Neighborhoods from the proposed project.</li> </ul>
3	N/A	Greg Cowdery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Cowdery noted that he is neutral on the proposed project, and that he supports moving the project through the approval process so that projects are eligible for future grant funding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff do no recommend any changes to the project as a result of this comment.</li> </ul>
3	N/A	Joy Bedrose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Bedrose requested a number of clarifications in regards to the implementation of the proposed project and the entitlement process for future developments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff have reviewed Ms. Bedrose's comments, and have provided a formal response to her comments in the Oral Comments section of this document.</li> <li>Staff do no recommend any changes to the project as a result of this comment.</li> </ul>
3	N/A	Angela Little	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Little noted concerns related to infrastructure to serve the proposed project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff do no recommend any changes to the project as a result of this comment.</li> </ul>
3	N/A	Trip Hord	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Hord noted that a number of parcels, located in the Lakeview Nuevo Area Plan are slated to be put into MSHCP conservation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After review of Mr. Hord's comments, staff has identified MSHCP lands within the project, and recommend excluding those parcels (outlined in the Staff Report Post Production Land Use Designation Changes) from the project.</li> </ul>

***Planning Commission Public Comments and Responses Matrix, October 5, 2016***

<b>3</b>	<b>N/A</b>	Norm Gritton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mr. Gritton noted concerns regarding split land use designations along Highway 74 in Nuevo.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• County Staff indicated that the proposed General Plan incorporates split designations as the County limited themselves to areas which were already proposed for higher intensity development; however, the parcels are entirely within the Community Development Foundation Component, and as such can apply for a new Land Use Designation outside of the 8-year Foundation Component Cycle.</li></ul>
----------	------------	--------------	---	---