Presentation Outline

- Memo from staff regarding correspondence received for Planning Commission Hearings re. GPA No. 960 and the CAP
- September 11, 2015 *Supplemental Response to Comments* document
- Recap of previous comments originally addressed during August 26, 2015 Planning Commission hearing
- Address comments submitted since August 26, 2015
- Responses to comments from Planning Commissioners
- Recap the Post Production Change Requests (Attachment C of August 19, 2015 Staff Report)
- Follow-up on any remaining Commissioner comments and questions

Review of Submitted Comments

Countywide Comments (Continued)

District	Comment Number	Commenter	Comments	Response
			Countywide	
ALL	7	Endangered Habitats League (Dan Silver)	• Mr. Silver noted concerns about the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) and potential hazards related to potential wildfire risks. • Mr. Silver also noted concern related to Map change Exhibit C2-15. • Mr. Silver noted concern about the use of the word "Prohibit" in Policy OS 14.3.	• Staff has reviewed Mr. Silver's suggested policies and recommends maintaining current WUI policy language. • The map change is currently included in Attachment C: Post Production Land Use Designation Changes as Item B-6 and is recommended for inclusion into GPA No. 960 by staff. • Staff has reviewed the requested policy change and recommends amending Policy OS 14.3 to change the word "Prohibit" to "Restrict" per Mr. Silver's request. (Refer to Supplemental Errata Document)
ALL	11	Valley-Wide Recreation and Park Districts (Loretta Domenigoni)	• The commenter indicated that they have no comments at this time	• No further action is recommended
ALL	17	Riverside County Farm Bureau (Michele Staples)	• Suggests several policy edits and increased coordination between the County and Farm Bureau during the development of measures related to water efficiency standards for agricultural operations. Refer to Comment Letter No. 16 for the proposed policy edits	• Staff have reviewed the requested policy edits for Policies LU 16.8, 20.10, and OS 5.5, and recommend the incorporation of all of the suggested edits into GPA No. 960. Furthermore, per the request of the Farm Bureau, the County will coordinate with the Farm Bureau during the development of measures related to the water efficiency standards for agricultural operations
ALL	10, 12	Property Owners of Riverside County (Bruce Colbert)	• Noted a number of comments pertaining to the status of CETAP corridors as well as new LOS policies within the County • The commenter asserts that the proposed amendments to the Circulation Element eliminate further consideration of the Orange County-Riverside County Transportation Corridor, including the much touted "tunnel option."	• Staff has responded to these concerns in both Final EIR No. 521 (Comments and Responses Letters 29 and 30) as well as in the Supplemental Response to Comments document (Comment Letters 8 and 13). • Staff has reviewed and responded to Mr. Colbert's concerns. During the Recirculation of the Draft EIR, Staff included an updated status of the CETAP corridors in the General Plan, and added clarifying language in the Circulation Element in regards to the updated LOS policies. No further action is recommended

Countywide Comments (Continued)

District	Comment Number	Commenter	Comments	Response
ALL	25	FEMA (via Gregor Blackburn)	• This comment requests that the County review the current effective countywide Flood Insurance Rate Maps for the County of Riverside • This comment summarizes the NFIP floodplain management building requirements • This comment notes that many NFIP participating communities have adopted floodplain management building requirements which are more restrictive than the minimum federal standards	• These comments are duly noted • The County compiles flood hazards maps using the Riverside County Special Flood Hazard Area database; this database is maintained by the RCFWCD and updated quarterly
ALL	28	Pala Tribal Historic Preservation Office	• The Pala Tribal Historic Preservation Office notes no concerns related to the Project at this time.	• No further action is recommended

District 1 Comments (Continued)

District 1				
District	**Comment Number**	**Commenter**	**Comments**	**Response**
1	8	Pete Peterson and Mel Vander Molen	• Requests to change the Land Use Designation of his and his neighbor's parcels from Rural Residential to Commercial Retail	• This request is currently listed as Figure A-15 in Attachment C, GPA No. 960 Post-Production Change Requests. • At this time, staff does not recommend inclusion of this request in GPA N0. 960 as it is a foundation change request.
1	13	Albert Avelar	• Mr. Avelar requests to retain the current land use designation on his parcel in Lakeland Village	• This request is currently listed as Figure B-1 in Attachment C, GPA No. 960 Post-Production Change Requests, of the General Plan Update Staff Report. Staff recommends inclusion of his response into GPA No. 960
1	18	Jannlee Watson	• Ms. Watson noted concerns about the splitting of the Temescal Valley between two area plans, and references to the Temescal Valley as the I-15 corridor in the General Plan. Ms. Watson also noted concerns about the removal of the Riverside to Orange County Tunnel Project, as well as heavy congestion in the Temescal Valley area. Ms. Watson is also concerned about discrepancies between the I-15 Express Lane Traffic Data and the GPA No. 960 traffic data	• Regarding the splitting of the Temescal Valley between Area Plans and references to the Temescal Valley in the Documents, these items will be reviewed in the 2016 General Plan Update. • Staff has updated the GPA No. 960 document to best reflect the current status of CETAP projects currently under consideration by the RCTC. Refer to page 4 and 5 of the GPA No. 960 Errata for these updates to the document. • The discrepancies between I-15 Express Lane Traffic Data and GPA No. 960 are due to different horizon years between the data and different baseline data. • No further action is recommended

District 1 Comments (Continued)

District	Comment Number	Commenter	Comments	Response
1	24	Janine Padia (Sares Regis Group)	• This comment expresses concern with respect to the alignment of Harley Knox Boulevard as depicted in the Circulation Plan and notes that the response to their prior letter does not adequately address their concern. • The comment continues to express the opinion that the alignment as depicted on the Circulation Plan exhibit designates a specific alignment • The comment again raises the issue of the potential disturbance of Native American cultural resources	• While the alignment would fall somewhere on the subject property, it is not an engineering alignment and is subject to interpretation • The alignment suggested by the commenter does not remotely reflect the Circulation Plan and would require a General Plan Amendment • While the County would surely like to identify an alignment that avoids such disturbance, the letter provides only vague reference to such resources and does not provide even a general description of their location or the extent of such resources
1	26	Gary Laughlin	• The commenter has requested a land use modification for the Kiley property to further refine the 2008 County Initiated Foundation Update • The requested modification would redesignate 1.7 acres from OS:CH to CD:VLDR and 0.2 acres from RR to CD:VLDR	• County staff have added the updated request to the Post Production Land Use Changes table (Attachment C of the Staff Report) as Item C-8. Staff does not recommend inclusion of Mr. Laughlin's revised request into GPA No. 960
1	27	Diana & William Powell	• The commenter has requested that her property remain designated as C-1 or if it is to be reclassified, be reclassified as R-3 or R-3 Tourist • The request involves parcels 386060048 & 386060019 in unincorporated Riverside County near the Ortega highway	• The County is not changing zoning through proposed GPA No. 960. Zoning is administrated through Ordinance 348, which is separate from GPA No. 960. • The County proposes the removal of the El Cariso Rural Village Study Area from the General Plan through GPA No. 960; it was determined that due to limited access and infrastructure capacity a Rural Village Overlay was inappropriate for El Cariso Village • The existing LUD on the parcel is Rural Residential (R:RR), and redesignation of the parcel from R:RR to a Commercial LUD (Commercial Retail or Commercial Tourist) would represent a foundation component land use change outside of the 8-year Foundation Amendment Cycle • County staff have added the updated request to the Post Production Land Use Changes table (Attachment C of the Staff Report) as Item A-16.

District 2 Comments

District	Comment Number	Commenter	Comments	Response
			District 2	
2	5	City of Eastvale (Michele Nissen)	• Requests the removal of the Cities of Eastvale and Jurupa Valley from GPA No. 960.	• Staff proposes the addition of new text to further clarify the incorporation of the City of Eastvale and Jurupa Valley in their respective area plans. (Refer to Supplemental Errata Document) • No further action is recommended
2	Verbal	Commissioner Hake	• Commissioner Hake requested follow-up on the request made by the City of Eastvale regarding the inclusion of Jurupa Valley and Eastvale into GPA No. 960	• Due to the broad scope of GPA No. 960, it is not feasible to update the document to reflect the adoption of all new land use documents that have occurred since the outset of the General Plan update process. As such, updates to the documents in order to reflect the incorporation of the City of Eastvale and Jurupa Valley are not feasible at this time. The County will however "grey" the newly incorporated areas in the document once the approval process is completed. Further, in the next General Plan update the document will be updated to reflect the incorporation of new cities within the County. The County does however acknowledge that the City has full jurisdictional control within its boundaries, despite the inclusion of Eastvale and Jurupa Valley within the General Plan.
2	Verbal	Larissa Adrian	• Mrs. Adrian is concerned about potential traffic impacts within the Temescal Valley, particularly the removal of the CETAP Corridor B (Irvine-Corona Expressway) and the Interstate 15 improvements between the Interstate 91 and Temescal Valley. • Mrs. Adrian noted concerns about discussion of schools within the General Plan and EIR.	• The General Plan was updated to include further discussion on the CETAP Corridors and their current status. Staff have updated the GPA No. 960 document to best reflect the current status of CETAP projects currently under consideration by the RCTC. Refer to pages 4 and 5 of the GPA No. 960 Errata for these updates to the document. • A full analysis of the GPA No. 960's impact on schools has been completed and is included in Section 4.17.5 of EIR No. 521. Furthermore, school districts are involved in project level analysis of all projects to ensure that adequate facilities are available for students within their district. However, school districts operate independently from the County and are under the jurisdiction of the County Superintendent of Schools and the State of California. As such, the County continues to coordinate with local districts; however, school district facility plans are ultimately within the purview of each individual school district and its associated Facilities Master Plan.
2	Verbal	Jerry Sincich	• Mr. Sincich noted support for comments made by fellow residents of the Temescal Valley. • Mr. Sincich noted concerns about the Post-Production Land Use Designation Changes.	• Staff have included the post-production changes in the staff report to ensure a thorough public review of the post-production changes that have been requested.

District 3 Comments

District	Comment Number	Commenter	Comments	Response
District 3				
3	1	Kathy Smigun	• Supports the land use change listed in Table 3.0-E (Summary of Criteria Based Parcel Specific Land Use Changes in San Jacinto Valley) and Exhibit C8-16 which will return the land use in Reinhardt Canyon to Rural Residential and Rural Mountainous • Supports the update to the text on page 7 of the San Jacinto Valley Area Plan referring to "tentatively approved subdivisions"	• The text on page 7 of the San Jacinto Valley Area Plan has been revised to remove the statement referring to tentatively approved subdivisions within Maze Stone, as requested • Staff appreciate Ms. Smigun's support of the Project and comments during the General Plan Amendment process; no further action is recommended
3	23	Winchester-Homeland Land Use Committee	• This comment requests that GPA No. 960 and EIR No. 521 reflect the Winchester Land Use Study and Winchester Downtown Core Plan • This comment requests that the community of Homeland be evaluated for any changes that may affect the current General Plan • This comment requests that the County of Riverside work alongside the Third District Supervisor, Planning Commission, and Planning Department to refine the Winchester Land Use Study and Downtown Core Plan	• These comments are duly noted • GPA No. 960 and EIR No. 521 use the date of the Notice of Preparation to establish a baseline for the documents; these documents adequately show the existing conditions of the County, as well as the community of Homeland, at the date of the release of the Notice of Preparation • The County Planning Department will continue to work with the Winchester Community to refine the Winchester Land Use Study and Downtown Core Plan and incorporate the Community's vision into the General Plan to the extent feasible during the 2016 General Plan Update
3	14, 22	Domenigoni-Barton Entities (Michele Staples)	• The commenter notes concerns about the potential applicability of the Dam Inundation Zone for the Diamond Valley Lake may apply to SP. 310. The commenter is concerned that this may preclude the development of SP. 310. • The commenter expresses concern that the dam inundation zone depicted in GPA No. 960 will result in future land use constraints due to its location on the Domenigoni property • The commenter requests that the Planning Commission approve a clarification in the dam inundation zone depicted on Figure S-10 and the related Figure 11 (Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan Flood Hazards) before approving GPA No. 960	• While the commenters concerns are noted, the inclusions of Dam Inundation Zones in GPA No. 960 is not intended to undermine the approved Specific Plan No. 310.

District 3 Comments (Continued)

District	Comment Number	Commenter	Comments	Response
			District 3	
3	2, 19, 20	Adrian McGregor	• Concerns related to the water supply in Riverside County and the potential future increase in water demand due to new development that may occur in the County, particularly in the City of Temecula and adjacent Wine Country • Concerns related to land use, circulation, and public utilities regarding potential future developments particularly in/near Wine Country adjacent to City of Temecula • Concerns related to a general lack of water, vehicle emissions exceeding thresholds, land use approvals, as well as the potential over-usage of water in Riverside County • Concerns related to greenhouse gas emissions resulting from infrastructure development	• Comments are formally addressed in the Supplemental Response to Comments Document • Project level environmental review, as well as existing regulatory requirements would ensure environmental issues are fully analyzed at the project level, and ensure sufficient water supply exists to serve new development. No further action is recommended • During a project's environmental review, any development over 500 residential units or non-residential of a certain scale pursuant to SB 610 and SB 221, must complete a Water Supply Assessment to ensure that a sufficient water supply exists to serve the project • Specific development projects are analyzed against the SCAQMD's project level air quality significance thresholds to determine if emissions would be significant and if mitigation measures are necessary • Any environmental impacts of future developments regarding circulation and infrastructure would also be addressed at the project level in project specific analyses
3	30	Grant Becklund	• Mr. Becklund noted support for GPA No. 960, specifically for the updates to the Reinhardt Canyon Land Use Designation changes. As a Menifee/Sun City resident, supports GPA No.960 land uses in proposed land use designations. Mr. Becklund would not support projects that would use Four Seasons as an emergency access for Reinhardt Canyon. Lastly, Mr. Becklund has also indicated to staff that he opposes GPA No. 1129 east of Menifee because of the intensive new development it would bring to a rural area.	• This comment is noted, no further action is recommended

District 4 Comments

District	Comment Number	Commenter	Comments	Response
District 4				
4	6	City of Coachella (Luis Lopez)	• Commenter noted concerns related to the compatibility of the County and City's circulation network, as well as land use compatibility between the County and City	• Due to the broad scope of GPA No. 960, it is not feasible to update the document to reflect the adoption of all new land use documents and policies that have occurred since the outset of the General Plan update process • The requested land use and circulation issues will be considered as part of the 2016 General Plan Update • Due to the large scale of the County, is not feasible to include maps within the document that are of a larger scale than provided. The County does provide online mapping resources for reference for analysis that may require closer evaluation. The County's online mapping program can be accessed from the Planning Department website (planning.rctlma.org)
4	9	MCS Yuma (Paula L. Backs)	• This comment indicates changes in the administration 228,000 acres from BLM to Department of the Navy within the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range.	• This comment is noted, no further action is recommended
4	15	Eduardo Guevara	• On August 18, 2015, the community submitted a land use plan for the Chiriaco Summit area. The community's plan sets aside 50% of the policy area to Commercial Retail uses with the remainder 50% for residential uses	• Staff has reviewed the submitted Chiriaco Summit land use plan. The plan still requires a further refined land use plan that considers circulation facilities, water resources, sewer facilities and/or septic capacity. • Further discussions with the community to refine the land use plan and analyses are necessary in order to fold it the Community's vision into the General Plan. • No further action is recommended
4	16	Paul DePalatis	• Mr. DePalatis requests the redesignation of a portion of Long Canyon Road from a Major Highway to a Collector	• The request is currently listed as Item C-7 of Attachment C: GPA No. 960 Post-Production Land Change Requests and staff does not recommended this requesst for inclusion into GPA No. 960

District 4 Comments (Continued)

District	Comment Number	Commenter	Comments	Response
District 4				
4	29	Cindy Nance	• Ms. Nance requests the inclusion of a number of updates to the Western Coachella Valley Area Plan to reflect the unique community of Desert Edge.	• These requested changes will be reviewed during the 2016 General Plan Update.
4	Verbal	Commissioner Hake	• Commissioner Hake requested the responses to the City of Coachella Letter submitted on August 19, 2015	• The letter has been formally responded to, and is included in the Commissioner's Briefing Packet as letter 6. Refer to the Response to Comments section of the packet for the submitted letter and formal responses
4	Verbal	Michelle Hasson	• Mrs. Hasson noted concerns with the EIR analysis, particularly in the Eastern Coachella Valley. Mrs. Hasson expressed that further analysis should be conducted for mobile home communities, to ensure access to safe drinking water, job access, maintenance of air quality standards, as well as other concerns.	• Mrs. Hasson noted similar concerns in during the public review period of the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report. Her comment letter, as well as the response from County staff, is included in draft Final EIR No. 521 in Section 2, Comments and Responses (Letter 28). The Draft EIR evaluated the issues noted, and responses to these areas of concern can be reviewed in Response No. 28 of the draft Final EIR No. 521 document. Due to the broad scope of Ms. Hasson's concerns, Ms. Hasson's comment letter on Recirculated Draft EIR No. 521, as well as the responses to the letter, have been attached for review as Attachment A to this document in order to provide sufficient information for Planning Commission's review.

District 5 Comments

District	Comment Number	Commenter	Comments	Response
District 5				
5	3	Emilio Uriarte	• Concerns related to a shortage of water and electrical power supply in California, as well as the sustainability of current population growth and development • also expresses concerns about the depletion of the Colorado River and low water levels in Lake Mead, as well as power generated by the Hoover Dam • The commenter notes support of the No Growth Alternative, which was ultimately rejected in Draft EIR No. 521 due to the fact that it would not achieve the Project objectives	• Comments are formally responded to in the Supplemental Response to Comments Document • Project environmental review, as well as regulatory safeguards upheld by local water districts and electricity suppliers would ensure sufficient water supply for new development projects. No further action is recommended. • During a project's environmental review, any development over 500 residential units or non-residential of a certain scale pursuant to SB 610 and SB 221, must complete a Water Supply Assessment to ensure that a sufficient water supply exists to serve the project • Regarding the Hoover Dam electrical power supply, the California Energy Commission and ISO regulates electrical generation and ensures the reliable supply of electrical energy by maintaining a level consistent with the need for such energy for protection of public health and safety, promotion of the general welfare, and environmental quality protection
5	4, 21	Terry & Carol Curtiss	• Concerns pertaining to the WRC-MSHCP, the Lakeview-Nuevo Area Plan, alternative energy requirements, the California drought, and the development of school facilities within the County • Concerns related to water supply within the county, the ongoing local and regional drought, and the proper disclosure and discussion of water related topics	• Refer to Letter4 and 21 of the Supplemental Response to Comments document for the submitted letter and Staff's response. • Extensive discussion related to the sufficiency of the MSHCP has been provided in Supplemental Response to Comments document. Water supply would be addressed at the project level, and regulated by the local water agency to ensure sufficient supple. Alternative energy sources are encouraged by the County, and have been included in the Climate Action Plan. Lastly, school facilities are overseen by the local school district, and are outside of the County Jurisdiction. No further action is recommended. • Project level environmental review, as well as existing regulatory requirements would ensure environmental issues are fully analyzed at the project level, and ensure sufficient water supply exists to serve new development. No further action is recommended

Comments Raised by the Commissioners

Commissioner Hake

- Commissioner Hake requested follow-up on the comment letter submitted by the City of Eastvale.
- Commissioner Hake requested the responses to the City of Coachella Letter submitted on August 19, 2015.
- Commissioner Hake requested clarification regarding the City of Menifee's request for additional language to be added to policy LU 1.3.
- Commissioner Hake wanted an update on the status of the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians comments submitted during the Recirculated Draft EIR Response to Comments Period.
- Commissioner Hake requested further information regarding comments made by the City of Riverside in regards to projects in proximity to the City's boundaries.

Commissioner Hake

- Commissioner Hake requested a number of updates to the Circulation Element of the General Plan. These changes have been reviewed and are included in the Supplemental Errata document.

Post Production Land Use Designation Changes
(Staff Report: Attachment C)

Section A

- Section A of the Post Production Change Request Table consists of LUD change requests that include a foundation change.

- Staff recommends that the Planning Commission not include these changes in GPA No. 960 as they would constitute a change in Foundation Component outside of the 8-Year foundation update cycle.

Section B

- Section B of the Post Production Change Requests Table consists of either:
    - Minor changes to existing LUD on a portion of a parcel that would not require substantive changes to EIR No. 521 or,
    - A mapping correction to a Policy Area
    - A net reduction in the LUD intensity
- Staff recommends that the Planning Commission include these changes in GPA No. 960 as they
    - Would not impact the existing analysis within the EIR and
    - Are not foundation changes.

Section C

- Section C of the Post Production Change Requests Table consists of LUD change requests that do not constitute a foundation change, however they do propose a potential LUD intensification on the parcel
- Such change requests may impact the conclusions reached in EIR No. 521
- Staff recommends that the Planning Commission not include the Section C change requests into GPA No. 960

Proposed Action

ADOPT Planning Commission Resolution No. 2015-011 recommending adoption of General Plan Amendment No. 960 as shown on Attachment E; and,

Recommend that the Board of Supervisors:

- **TENTATIVELY CERTIFY ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 521 based on the findings set forth in EIR No. 521 which has been completed in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the Riverside County CEQA implementing procedures; pending resolution adoption by the Board of Supervisors; and,**
- **TENTATIVELY APPROVE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 960 with the addition of the Post Production Change Requests in Section B set forth in Attachment C of the staff report dated August 19, 2015, based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; pending resolution adoption by the Board of Supervisors**
- **APPROVE THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY CLIMATE ACTION PLAN**

Thank You