

Exhibit A

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

And

**STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING
CONSIDERATIONS**

**OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY**

For the

2003 RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

October 7, 2003

I. INTRODUCTION

In 2020, Riverside County will be home to approximately 2.8 million people, who will occupy approximately 918,000 dwelling units. This represents a doubling of the present population and housing stock of Riverside County. It is projected that Riverside County will continue to grow to 3.5 million people by 2030, and to 4.5 million people by 2040. These residents will be located within 24 incorporated cities, as well as within numerous unincorporated areas. (Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”), pp. 1-1, 3-1.) The challenge of balancing the housing, transportation, and economic needs of existing and future populations with limited natural resources and the sensitivity of the natural environment required Riverside County to develop the Riverside County Integrated Plan (RCIP), which consists of three coordinated plans to determine future planning, transportation, and conservation needs for Riverside County. These plans include the 2003 Riverside County General Plan, the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), and the Community Environmental and Transportation Acceptability Program (CETAP). (DEIR, p. 3-1.)

The MSHCP involves the assembly and management of a reserve system for the conservation of natural habitats and their constituent wildlife populations. The MSHCP establishes a framework for complying with State and federal endangered species regulations, while accommodating future growth within the cities and unincorporated portions of western Riverside County. Thus, unlike the proposed General Plan, the MSHCP covers only the western portion of the County, and covers not only unincorporated areas, but cities as well. (DEIR, p. 3-6.) The CETAP component of RCIP identifies transportation corridors to meet the future transportation needs of Riverside County. CETAP is a multi-modal planning effort that considers highway options, and also looks at transit and other forms of travel demand management and goods movement. (DEIR, p. 3-7.)

The proposed 2003 Riverside County General Plan (Comprehensive General Plan Amendment No. GPA00618) (the “General Plan” or the “Project”) is an attempt to promote a more focused and balanced pattern of growth that accommodates the demand for housing, employment opportunities, and public facilities and services while minimizing the potential adverse impacts that may result from increased urban development. The Riverside County General Plan Final Program EIR (EIR No. 441, State Clearinghouse No. 2002051143) (“Final EIR” or “FEIR”) addresses the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed General Plan. (DEIR, p. 2-1.) The FEIR is intended to serve as an informational document for public agency decision-makers and the general public regarding the objectives and components of the proposed General Plan, which is the proposed project for the purpose of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq; DEIR, p. 2-1.) The FEIR addresses the potential significant adverse environmental impacts that may be associated with build out of the proposed General Plan, and identifies feasible mitigation measures and alternatives that may be adopted to reduce or eliminate these impacts. (DEIR, p. 2-1.)

The FEIR is the primary reference document for the formulation and implementation of a mitigation monitoring program for the proposed General Plan. Environmental impacts cannot always be mitigated to a level that is considered less than significant. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.), if a lead agency approves a project that has significant impacts that are not substantially mitigated (i.e., significant unavoidable impacts), the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons for approving the project based on the final CEQA documents and any other information in the public record for the project. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15093, subd. (b).) This is called a “statement of overriding considerations.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15093.) (DEIR, p. 2-2.)

The Final EIR consists of the following contents:

- A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR (Section 1.4);
- The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the public review and consultation process (Section 2.0);
- Revisions made to the Draft EIR (August 20, 2002), State of California Clearinghouse No. 2002051143, in the form of an addendum presented in Section 3.0; and
- The Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) (Section 4.0).

(FEIR, p. 1-1.)

On October 7, 2003, the Board of Supervisors certified the FEIR in accordance with CEQA. These findings, as well as the accompanying statement of overriding considerations in section XV, *infra*, have been prepared to comply with CEQA.

II.

FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would *substantially lessen* the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" (Emphasis added.) The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will *avoid* or *substantially lessen* such significant effects." (Emphasis added.) Section 21002 goes on to state that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See Pub. Resources Code § 21081, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).) For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The first such finding is that "[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The second permissible finding is that "[s]uch changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(2).) The third potential conclusion is that "[s]pecific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(3).) Public Resources Code section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (See also *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* ("*Goleta II*") (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565.)

The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417.) "[F]easibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (*Id.*; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.)

The CEQA Guidelines do not define the difference between "avoiding" a significant environmental effect and merely "substantially lessening" such an effect. The County must therefore glean the meaning of these terms from the other contexts in which the terms are used. Public Resources Code section 21081, on which CEQA Guidelines section 15091 is based, uses the term "mitigate" rather than "substantially lessen." The CEQA Guidelines therefore equate "mitigating" with "substantially lessening." Such an understanding of the statutory term is consistent with the policies underlying CEQA, which include the policy that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects." (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002.)

For purposes of these findings, the term "avoid" refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less than significant level. In contrast, the term "substantially lessen" refers to the effectiveness of such measure or measures to substantially reduce the severity of a significant effect, but not to reduce that effect to a less than significant level. These interpretations appear to be mandated by the holding in *Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 519-521, in which the Court of Appeal held that an agency had satisfied its obligation to substantially lessen or avoid significant effects by adopting numerous mitigation measures, not all of which rendered the significant impacts in question less than significant.

Although CEQA Guidelines section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is "avoid[ed] or substantially lessen[ed]," these findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether the effect in question has been reduced to a less than significant level, or has simply been substantially lessened but remains significant.

Moreover, although section 15091, read literally, does not require findings to address environmental effects that an EIR identifies as merely "potentially significant," these findings will nevertheless fully account for all such effects identified in the Final EIR.

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a), (b).)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "benefits" rendered "acceptable" its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects." (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).) The California Supreme Court has stated,

"[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced." (*Goleta II*, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.)

These findings constitute the Board of Supervisors' best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the General Plan in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. To the extent that these findings conclude that various proposed mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded or withdrawn, the County hereby binds itself to implement these measures. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when the Board adopts a resolution approving the General Plan.

III. DEFINITIONS

“A-P” means Alquist-Priolo

“AB” means Assembly Bill

“af” means acre feet

“ARB” means March Air Reserve Base

“BLM” means Bureau of Land Management

“BMPs” means Best Management Practices

“Caltrans” means California Department of Transportation

“CCR” means California Code of Regulations

“CDFG” means California Department of Fish and Game

“CEQA” means California Environmental Quality Act

“CETAP” means Community Environmental and Transportation Acceptability Program

“CGS” means California Geologic Survey

“CIWMB” means California Integrated Waste Management Board

“CIWMP” means Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan

“CVC” means California Vehicle Code

“dB” means decibel, or a unit for describing the amplitude of sound

“dBA L_{eq} ” means equivalent sound level

“dBA L_{dn} ” means day night noise level

“dBA” means decibel measured through the A-weighted scale to correct for the relative frequency response of the human ear

“DEIR” means Draft Environmental Impact Report

“EIR” means Environmental Impact Report

“FEMA” means Federal Emergency Management Agency

“FIRM” means Flood Insurance Rate Maps

“HCP” means habitat conservation plan

“I” means Interstate

“IS” means Initial Study

“km” means kilometer

“LAFCO” means Local Agency Formation Commission

“LOMA” means Letter of Map Amendment

“LOMR-F” means Letter of Map Revision based on fill

“LOS” means level of service

“MLD” means most likely descendent

“MSHCP” means Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan

“NAHC” means Native American Heritage Commission

“NOP” means Notice of Preparation

“NPDES” means National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

“PM₁₀” means particulate matter smaller than 10 micrometers

“RCIP” means Riverside County Integrated Project *or Riverside County Integrated Plan (see 2-4)*

“REMAP” means Riverside Extended Mountain Area Plan

“RWQCB” means Regional Water Quality Control Board

“SCAG” means Southern California Association of Governments

“SCAQMD” means South Coast Air Quality Management District

“SR” means State Route

“TLMA” means Transportation and Land Management Agency

“USFWS” means United States Fish and Wildlife Service

“USGS” means United States Geologic Survey

“VMT” means vehicle miles traveled

IV. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Overview

The General Plan is intended to be a blueprint for the future of Riverside County. It describes anticipated future growth, development, and environmental management programs over the long term. It is intended to act as a “constitution” for public and private development, and to serve as the foundation for growth and land-use-related decision-making within unincorporated Riverside County. Most of the unincorporated portions of Western Riverside County and some of Eastern Riverside County are divided into 19 Area Plans to provide more detailed land use and policy direction regarding local issues, such as land use, circulation, and open space. The General Plan is meant to express the community’s goals with respect to the man-made and natural environments, and to set forth the policies and implementation measures needed to achieve those goals for the welfare of those who live, work, and do business in Riverside County. (DEIR, pp. 1-1, 3-81.)

Discretionary Actions

The following discretionary actions are anticipated to be taken by Riverside County as part of the proposed project:

- Adoption of the 2003 Riverside County General Plan, which incorporates 19 Area Plans as part of the Riverside County General Plan, and
- Adoption of proposed boundary changes to zoning districts to coincide with the 19 Area Plan boundaries.

(DEIR, pp.1-5, 2-4, 3-1.)

Project Objectives

The primary goal of the General Plan is to provide residents of the County with a blueprint for public and private development. The General Plan will act as the foundation upon which County leaders will make growth and land use-related decisions. The objective of the proposed General Plan is to achieve the Vision Statement of the County residents in conformance with State planning law. The Vision Statement is detailed in Chapter 2 of the proposed General Plan and is provided in Appendix B of the FEIR. (DEIR, p. 3-84.)

More specifically, the project objectives are to preserve crucial open space, provide a range of community design options in response to varied lifestyle choices, focus on high quality growth by using land resources efficiently, retain economically valuable agricultural lands, provide a comprehensive transportation system, provide public access to recreation opportunities, and expand local employment opportunities and broaden choices of transportation systems. (DEIR, p. 6-59.)

Project Location

The County of Riverside encompasses 7,295 square miles, and stretches across 200 miles from the eastern portion of the Los Angeles metropolitan area to the Colorado River. Bounded by Orange County on the west, San Bernardino County to the north, the State of Arizona to the east, and San Diego and Imperial Counties to the south, Riverside County is the fourth largest county area in California. (DEIR, p. 3-1.)

Within Riverside County, there are 24 incorporated cities with individual identities set among a mixture of rural communities, small towns, deserts, and open space areas. The various communities within the unincorporated areas are defined by the built environment and the surrounding topography, which includes river valleys, lakes, low deserts, mountains, foothills, and rolling plains. (DEIR, p. 4.4-1.)

Riverside County is divided into eastern and western regions by the San Jacinto Mountains. A deep valley known as the San Gorgonio Pass, formed by the San Jacinto and San Gorgonio Mountains, serves as a natural link between these two vast areas. The San Bernardino, Little San Bernardino, and Pinto Mountains form a portion of the County's northern boundary while numerous mountain ranges, including those in the Santa Rosa Wilderness and Cleveland National Forest, serve as boundaries along the southern and western edges of the County. (DEIR, p. 4.4-1.)

Riverside County is one of the most diverse counties in California. It includes well-established urban, suburban, and rural communities. It has an extensive array of agricultural lands, lands devoted to mineral extraction, and recreational areas. There are rugged mountains, flat valley areas, open desert, and expansive natural open space areas. The western portion of the County contains most of the County's non-desert areas, as well as most of its urbanized areas. Elevations within this area range from about 755 feet in the northwestern corner of the County to about 10,800 feet at San Jacinto Peak. Eastern Riverside County, which lies east of the crest of the San Jacinto Mountains, contains almost all the County's desert regions. Elevations in eastern Riverside County range from about 230 feet below mean sea level at the Salton Sea to about 9,800 feet in the San Jacinto Mountains. (DEIR, p. 3-1.)

Western Riverside County

Western Riverside County is bounded by the Santa Ana Mountains and Cleveland National Forest on the west and the San Jacinto Mountains and the San Bernardino National Forest on the east. Topography varies dramatically in this region, ranging from low-lying valleys to rolling hillsides and steep mountainous terrain with large rock outcroppings. Major features of this area include the Santa Ana River basin, Lake Mathews, Lake Perris, Lake Elsinore, Lake Skinner, Vail Lake, the San Jacinto River, Murrieta Creek, the Santa Margarita River, and the vineyard/citrus region near Temecula. The Diamond Valley Reservoir south of Hemet is the largest reservoir in Southern California. Western Riverside County includes numerous unincorporated communities as well as the Cities of Corona, Riverside, Beaumont, Banning, Norco, Lake Elsinore, Perris, Hemet, San Jacinto, Moreno Valley, Calimesa, Canyon Lake, Murrieta, and Temecula. (DEIR, p. 4.4-1.)

Eastern Riverside County

Eastern Riverside County is bounded by the Colorado River on the east and the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains on the west. This area includes the Joshua Tree National Park, Whitewater River, and a portion of the Salton Sea. The most urbanized areas in this portion of the County are contained in the Coachella Valley. This area includes the incorporated cities of Desert Hot Springs, Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Rancho Mirage, Indian Wells, Palm Desert, La Quinta, Indio and Coachella, and is noted for its golf resorts nestled among the Santa Rosa Mountains and date palm groves. The vast mountainous terrain of Joshua Tree National Park and the desert topography of the Chuckwalla Valley lie between the Coachella Valley, and the Colorado River. The Palo Verde Valley lies westerly of the Colorado River and includes the City of Blythe. (DEIR, pp. 4.4-1 to 4.4-2.)

Relationships and Differences Between RCIP Components

The General Plan recognizes the Western Riverside County MSHCP, and incorporates the MSHCP into its Area Plans as mitigation for the biological impacts that will result from development permitted by the proposed General Plan. The proposed General Plan also incorporates by reference the Coachella Valley MSHCP being prepared by the Coachella Valley Association of Governments parallel to, but separate from, RCIP. The proposed General Plan Circulation Element includes proposed CETAP corridors as part of its proposed roadway and highway system. (DEIR, p. 3-7.)

The MSHCP provides comprehensive mitigation for the development impacts that will result from development of the proposed General Plan land uses and transportation facilities (including CETAP corridors) within the western portion of the County, including development of proposed

CETAP corridors. The MSHCP also includes CETAP corridors as permitted activities where they cross MSHCP preserve areas. (DEIR, p. 3-7.)

The three components of RCIP each cover different areas of the County. The proposed General Plan covers unincorporated lands throughout Riverside County, but does not have jurisdiction over March Air Reserve Base (ARB), Indian lands, and lands owned by the State and federal governments. The MSHCP covers all of western Riverside County, including County and City jurisdictions, since western County cities are participating in the program. CETAP addresses specific corridors only. (DEIR, pp. 3-7 to 3-8.)

The proposed General Plan has been prepared pursuant to the provisions of the California Government Code, and requires approval only of the County of Riverside. Environmental documentation for the proposed General Plan is subject only to the provisions of CEQA. Certain actions and developments undertaken pursuant to the proposed General Plan may require approvals of outside agencies. The MSHCP is being prepared pursuant to both State and federal law, and requires approval of the County, each participating city, the CDFG, and the USFWS. Environmental documentation for the MSHCP is subject to the provisions of both CEQA and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Riverside County is the lead agency for CEQA purposes, while the USFWS is the lead agency for NEPA purposes. The CETAP program proposes using local, State, and federal sources to fund right-of-way acquisition and ultimate construction of CETAP corridors. Thus, environmental documentation for CETAP must comply with the provisions of both CEQA and NEPA. Riverside County is the lead agency for CEQA purposes, while the Federal Highway Administration is the lead agency for NEPA purposes. (DEIR, pp. 3-7 to 3-8.)

Although they are clearly related projects, and are each part of an integrated planning program, as described above, each RCIP component covers a different physical area, is being prepared pursuant to different State and federal laws, involves different agencies in their approval, and has different lead agencies for their environmental documentation. In addition, each RCIP component is on a slightly different schedule. As a result of these differences, preparation of a single environmental document was found to be impractical. Such a document would prove to be overly complex and impossible to understand. Instead, each environmental document prepared from components of the RCIP program contains a cumulative impact analysis, summarizing the overall impacts of RCIP. (DEIR, p. 3-8.)

Project Description

The General Plan describes anticipated future growth over the long-term. The proposed General Plan is meant to express the community's goals with respect to the man-made and natural environments, and to set forth the policies and implementation measures needed to achieve those

goals for the welfare of those who live, work, and do business in Riverside County. (DEIR, pp. 3-1, 3-6 to 3-7.)

State law requires each city and County to adopt a General Plan that contains, at a minimum, the following seven “elements:”

- C The LAND USE ELEMENT designates the general distribution and intensity of uses of the land for housing, business, industry, open space, education, public buildings and grounds, waste disposal facilities, and other categories of public and private uses.
- C The CIRCULATION ELEMENT is correlated with the land use element, and identifies the general locations and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and other local public utilities and facilities.
- C The HOUSING ELEMENT is a comprehensive assessment of current and projected housing needs for all economic segments of the community, as well as groups having special housing needs (e.g., homeless, farm workers, elderly, handicapped). In addition, it embodies policy for providing adequate housing and includes action programs for this purpose.
- C The CONSERVATION ELEMENT addresses the conservation, development, and use of natural resources, including water, forests, soils, rivers, and mineral deposits.
- C The OPEN SPACE ELEMENT details plans and measures for preserving open space for natural resources, the managed production of resources, outdoor recreation, public health and safety, and the identification of agricultural land.
- C The NOISE ELEMENT identifies and appraises noise problems within the community and forms the basis for land use distribution.
- C The SAFETY ELEMENT establishes policies and programs to protect the community from risk associated with seismic, geologic, flood, and fire hazards. (DEIR, pp. 3-8 to 3-9.)

In the proposed General Plan, the Conservation and Open Space Elements have been combined into a Multipurpose Open Space Element. In addition to the seven mandatory General Plan elements, the proposed General Plan includes an Air Quality Element that addresses means to achieve and maintain good quality air throughout the County. (DEIR, p. 3-9.)

The proposed General Plan is an attempt to promote a more focused and balanced pattern of growth that accommodates the demand for housing, employment opportunities, and public facilities and services while minimizing the potential adverse impacts that may result from increased urban development. The policies and land use design of the proposed General Plan have been developed using a set of key land use concepts. These key concepts fall under ten general categories: Agriculture, Compact Development, Economic Development, Housing, Jobs and Housing Balance, Mixed-Use and Activity Centers, Multi-Purpose Open Space, Rural

Preservation, Service Provision, and Variety of Communities. (DEIR, pp. 3-9 to 3-10.) Five “foundation components” are established: Community Development, Rural Community, Rural, Agriculture and Open Space. The Area Plans further divide these foundation components into 27 land use designations, plus various overlays, each containing a specific description of allowable uses and development standards. The majority of western Riverside County and a portion of eastern Riverside County are in Area Plans. For that area of eastern Riverside County that is not in an Area Plan, the overlying foundation components of the General Plan, discussed above, are the land use designations. Riverside County does not have land use jurisdiction over the area within boundaries of March Air Reserve Base. (DEIR, p. 3-10.)

The proposed General Plan provides, in the form of text and maps, identification of County policy regarding the appropriate type and intensity of land use for every parcel within unincorporated Riverside County. In doing so, the proposed General Plan identifies lands for housing, business, industry, public facilities, recreation, and other uses. (DEIR, p. 3-5.)

The proposed General Plan also provides plans for a multi-modal transportation system, including intensive improvements to the existing roadway and highway system, to facilitate mobility of people and goods throughout unincorporated Riverside County. In addition, the General Plan incorporates a detailed program to ensure adequate housing opportunities for all economic segments of the community, including provisions for the County to accept its “fair share” of its regional housing needs of low and moderate income households. (DEIR, p. 3-5.)

Other portions of the General Plan are aimed at protecting open space and other environmental resources. These portions of the proposed General Plan aim at preserving lands needed for the managed production of resources (e.g., agricultural lands), protection of public health and safety (e.g., floodplains), outdoor recreation (e.g., parks), and protection of environmental resources (e.g., sensitive natural habitat areas). The proposed General Plan also addresses management of key environmental resources such as wildlife habitats, water resources, and air quality. (DEIR, p. 3-5.)

Portions of the proposed General Plan address issues of public health and safety in relation to such environmental hazards as earthquakes and associated seismically-induced hazards, flooding, wildland fire, soil erosion, and blow sand. The proposed General Plan sets standards for the protection of the public from these hazards. Finally, the proposed General Plan addresses noise-related hazards, and establishes standards to achieve and maintain noise-compatible land use relationships. (DEIR, p. 3-5.)

The proposed General Plan covers all unincorporated portions of the County. Lands within unincorporated areas that are owned by the federal government, (e.g., Joshua Tree National Monument, military reservations and BLM lands,) the State government (e.g., Lake Perris) and Indian tribes are not subject to County jurisdiction. (DEIR, p. 3-5.)

Area Plans

Eastvale Area Plan

The unincorporated Eastvale area ranges in character from urban development to agricultural and open space uses. Recognizing that dairy activities are not likely to be viable long-term uses in Eastvale, the Eastvale Area Plan Land Use Plan seeks to provide new areas for development throughout the planning area, while preserving the open space character of the Santa Ana River corridor. (DEIR, p. 3-20.)

The Eastvale Area Plan Land Use Plan consists primarily of Community Development land uses, with Medium Density Residential being the predominant land use designation. Commercial Retail, Commercial Office, Business Park, Light Industrial, and residential uses ranging from Low Density Residential to High Density Residential, are depicted on the Plan. It provides for up to two Community Centers, providing activity centers with a mix of employment, civic and residential uses. The Santa Ana River floodplain contains a mix of Open Space-Conservation, Open Space-Recreation and Open Space-Water designations. (DEIR, p. 3-20.)

Agriculture uses are designated in the southwest corner of the planning area, north of the Prado Dam Basin. Light Industrial uses are designated in the northwest corner of Eastvale, reflecting appropriate uses allowed within the Chino Airport Safety Zone. (DEIR, p. 3-20.)

Elsinore Area Plan

The Elsinore Area Plan reflects the proposed General Plan objectives for Riverside County in several ways. It does so by intensifying and mixing uses at nodes adjacent to transportation corridors, by more accurately reflecting topography and natural resources in land use designations, by avoiding high intensity development in natural hazard areas, and by considering compatibility with adjacent communities' land use plans as well as the desires of residents in the plan area. It provides for up to two Community Centers. The land use designations maintain the rural community character of Meadowbrook and Warm Springs, the natural and recreational characteristics of the Cleveland National Forest, and Community Development uses in Wildomar and Cleveland Ridge. In addition to providing habitat and recreational value, the conservation linkages within the Area Plan help provide a separation between communities and provide additional definition for existing communities. (DEIR, pp. 3-20, 3-25.)

Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan

This Area Plan reflects a significant shift from the existing rural character to a more urban/suburban/rural mix focused around unique cores. The impetus for this shift is the Diamond Valley Lake and the recreational opportunities it presents. In addition, the transit

opportunities presented by the rail line, State Route 74 (SR-74), and State Route 79 (SR-79) create natural crossroads to expand upon. (DEIR, p. 3-25.)

The communities of Romoland, Homeland, and Green Acres, together called Harvest Valley, make up the northern portion of the Harvest Valley/Winchester planning area. They contain dispersed commercial, business, and residential uses along SR-74. A Mixed-Use Planning Area is planned to be located along the south side of SR-74, and easterly of Briggs Road, to act as a focus for the communities of Homeland and Romoland. Medium, Low and Very Low Density Residential uses surround the more intense uses along the highway, with Mountainous designations applied to the Lakeview Mountains and Double Butte, respectively. The former landfill site on Double Butte is designated as Public Facilities. (DEIR, p. 3-25.)

The community of Green Acres, located in the eastern portion of the planning area, is a Low Density Residential community that is presently separated from the City of Hemet by vacant land and mountainous terrain. To the southeast of this community, development is restricted due to the proximity to the Hemet Ryan Airport. The Rural Community and Mountainous land use designations southeast of Green Acres serve to distinguish Green Acres from Winchester, as well as the City of Hemet. Green Acres also includes a policy area that allows for continued equestrian and animal keeping uses. (DEIR, p. 3-25.)

Western Riverside County has a special visual quality created by the numerous land forms at varying scales that rise from the valley floors. Such is the case with Double Butte, which includes a closed landfill site. This public facility designated area is surrounded on three sides by mountainous terrain. (DEIR, p. 3-25.)

The community of Winchester is located immediately south of Double Butte and north of Salt Creek. Winchester is ideally situated to become the “gateway to the Diamond Valley” and accommodate significant intensification of land usage. Winchester has the potential to serve as an important tourist and transit hub for the region due to its proximity to the Diamond Valley Lake, as well as the presence of the rail line, SR-79 and Domenigoni Parkway. To most effectively take advantage of these opportunities, future development in Winchester should reflect a distinct character and identity. Typical strip commercial uses would diminish the community’s potential significantly. Instead, a compact downtown core designed in an Old West theme is envisioned. To help make this vision become a reality, the Community Center Overlay allows a mixture of commercial, office, and residential uses to be developed and provides guidance for future community design. Contrary to typical zoning that separates uses, the Community Center Overlay allows a mixture of commercial, office, and residential uses within the same project. Like a western town, Winchester should be developed around a series

of walkable blocks with buildings oriented to the street. Western-themed building facades with detailed touches, such as covered and wooden sidewalks, could further enhance the theme experience. (DEIR, pp. 3-25, 3-29.)

A core of retail, shopping, office, and residential uses should stretch along Winchester Road from the rail line to Olive Avenue. Medium density residential uses should be located within and around the core area to provide convenient pedestrian access to services, shopping, and employment uses. (DEIR, p. 3-29.)

A transit station on the rail line should be incorporated into the fabric of Winchester and act as the northern anchor for the community. This transit station would act as the regional connection to the Diamond Valley Lake and its surrounding entertainment and recreational uses, as well as Temecula farther to the south. (DEIR, p. 3-29.)

The Diamond Valley Lake and surrounding recreation area provides a major tourist attraction and is the key to future growth in the area. The land uses that surround the Diamond Valley Lake are intended to preserve this facility's long-term outdoor recreational opportunities and to attract visitors by providing a quality experience for them. (DEIR, p. 3-29.)

To the south of the Diamond Valley Lake, the Open Space-Conservation Habitat and Open Space-Recreation land use designations preserve the natural habitat of the Dawson Mountains and Shipley Reserve as well as providing areas for permanent outdoor recreation. To the west of the lake, the Commercial Tourist land use designation accommodates the intensive recreation plans of the Metropolitan Water District. (DEIR, p. 3-29.)

The Community Center Overlay with an underlying Mixed Use Planning Area land use designation immediately west of SR-79, south of Holland Road, accommodates an Entertainment Center that is intended to capitalize on the proximity of the lake and its intensive recreational opportunities. The Entertainment Center land use designation provides the opportunity to develop regional entertainment, recreation, and tourist related uses such as movie theaters, hotels, spas, and restaurants. This area is envisioned as a unified pedestrian-oriented village with a common design theme, integrated with the active recreation uses to the east. The center should be designed to accommodate pedestrian movement, and the presence of the automobile should be minimized by reducing street widths, locating parking behind buildings, and/or combining parking in structures. Sidewalks should be wide with ample street furniture and shade trees to create a pleasant pedestrian environment. (DEIR, p. 3-30.)

A transit station should be incorporated into this Entertainment Center. This transit station can be connected to the Winchester Transit Station through a transit system. The transit line would then follow Winchester Avenue south into the Temecula Valley, providing a convenient tourism connection for the major attractions of the region. (DEIR, p. 3-30.)

Highgrove Area Plan

Conservation of habitat, preservation of existing communities, and orderly community expansion easterly of Highgrove are the primary objectives of the Highgrove Area Plan. (DEIR, p. 3-30.)

West of Interstate 215 (I-215), in the vicinity of Main Street, the Land Use Plan designates the land as Light Industrial. Very Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Commercial Retail, and Light Industrial lands are designated immediately west of I-215 in keeping with the area's existing patterns of development, with higher residential densities for existing mobile home parks. The portion of Highgrove located immediately east of I-215 contains a mix of urban uses, including Medium Density, Medium High and Highest Density Residential, Commercial Retail, and Light Industrial uses. The eastern half of this area is designated for Low and Medium density Residential uses. Light Industrial uses are designated for the area south of Palmyrita Avenue, which is compatible with adjacent industrial and distribution uses in the City of Riverside. (DEIR, p. 3-30.)

The central portion of the planning area, south of Highgrove, contains Open Space-Conservation areas associated with the Box Springs Mountains Park, along with Rural Mountainous, Rural Residential, and Very Low Density Residential uses. Slope, habitat and other natural constraints severely limit opportunities to provide substantial areas for population or employment growth. In the southern portion of the planning area, a mix of urban uses is planned in close proximity to SR-60, pursuant to the Gateway Center Specific Plan, including a range of residential, employment-generating, and public land uses. (DEIR, p. 3-30.)

Jurupa Area Plan

The Jurupa Area Plan provides for substantial areas devoted to rural and equestrian uses, as allowed by the Rural Community Foundation component. The land use plan also allows for traditional urban residential densities as reflected by the Medium Density and Medium High Density Residential designations. Complementing these residential land uses are several Commercial Retail corridors, two Community Center Overlays, several scattered Open Space-Conservation and Recreation areas, large chunks of Open Space-Conservation Habitat land in the Santa Ana River corridor and the Jurupa Mountains, and an abundance of employment opportunities within the Light Industrial and Business Park designations along Interstate 15 (I-15), State Route (SR-60), and Van Buren Boulevard. Mining uses are also identified within the Jurupa Mountains. (DEIR, p. 3-33.)

To help provide focal points for this sector of the County, the Community Center Overlay is applied within Rubidoux Village Center along Mission Boulevard, and westerly of Interstate 15, northerly of Bellegrave Avenue. These areas are intended to function as Village Centers, with a mixture of residential, retail, office, and public uses in close proximity. The strategic location of

these centers offers compelling reasons to focus attention on such a valuable economic resource. The Community Center Overlay in Rubidoux takes advantage of the existing pattern of development on Mission Boulevard by allowing for residential units next to commercial uses, thereby increasing the vitality of the Rubidoux Village core area. (DEIR, p. 3-33.)

The employment centers envisioned at the I-15/SR-60 junction, along Van Buren Boulevard, and in the Agua Mansa area would provide regional services with a mixture of business park and industrial uses. Typical employment uses within Business Park and Light Industrial designated areas include research and development, manufacturing, assembling, research institutions, academic institutions, medical facilities, and support commercial uses. Heavy Industrial designated areas would accommodate the most intensive types of industrial activities, including heavy manufacturing and processing plants. The proximity to a major freeway and railroad provides an opportunity for regional multi-modal transportation connections. Combined with the relatively compact activities envisioned in the Community Centers, these highly valuable access facilities offer the long-term potential to accommodate improved transit access. (DEIR, p. 3-33.)

Future multi-modal transportation options are a part of this Plan because of the need to ultimately take some of the pressure from the highway and freeway systems. This is particularly critical here because of the extensive truck traffic, which complicates vehicle flow despite its obvious linkage to economic development. Warehousing uses would be restricted by policy to a specific geographic area. (DEIR, p. 3-33.)

Large swaths of open space line the Santa Ana River corridor, providing an expansive natural buffer between Jurupa and the City of Riverside. Portions of the Jurupa Mountains also contain Open Space designations intended to preserve the rugged nature of this area and protect sensitive habitat areas. Recreational open space areas designed for relatively heavy use, such as golf courses and athletic fields, are located throughout Jurupa. The pattern and types of land uses described above are an extension of the existing land use patterns for Jurupa, and consequently help maintain the identity and character of its many distinctive communities. Selective additions to the land use choices refine the potential here without changing the basic character of these local communities. Additionally, preserving the natural features and unique landscape helps to distinguish this area from surrounding communities. (DEIR, p. 3-33.)

Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan

The Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan provides for substantial areas devoted to rural and equestrian uses, as allowed by the Rural Community and Rural Foundation components. The land use plan limits urban residential densities as reflected by the Medium Density Residential

and Medium High Density Residential designations largely to areas within adopted specific plans. Complementing these residential land uses are scattered commercial retail uses, including a commercial corridor along Van Buren Boulevard, several recreational areas, large chunks of habitat land in the Lake Mathews/Estelle Reserve area and the Gavilan Hills, and public facility uses associated with the Metropolitan Water District operations at the Lake Mathews facility and the expanded El Sobrante Landfill. (DEIR, p. 3-37.)

Large swaths of open space border Lake Mathews, providing an expansive natural buffer between the lake and adjacent development. The pattern and types of land uses described above are an extension of the existing land use patterns for Woodcrest and Lake Mathews, and consequently help maintain the identity and character of its distinctive communities. Selective additions to the land use choices refine the potential here without changing the basic character of these local communities. Additionally, preserving the natural features and unique landscape helps to distinguish this area from surrounding communities. (DEIR, p. 3-37.)

Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan

The Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan reflects significant growth in its western half, near the City of Perris. Residential density gradually decreases east of the San Jacinto River until the Lakeview Mountains, where the Mountainous and Rural land use designations reflect the area's rugged nature. A series of adopted specific plans, concentrated east of the San Jacinto River, have influenced land use patterns and residential densities in this area. East of the San Jacinto River, the Area Plan generally reflects a pattern of predominantly low and very low density residential character with pockets of commercial uses interspersed within the communities of Lakeview and Nuevo. Continuing east past Lakeview Avenue, the land use pattern is primarily large lot and rural in nature with clusters of residential neighborhoods, public facilities, and commercial establishments. This Area Plan provides for two community centers west of the San Jacinto River. (DEIR, p. 3-37.)

Mead Valley Area Plan

The Mead Valley Area Plan provides for a predominantly rural community character with an equestrian focus. This is reflected by the Rural Residential and Very Low Density Residential land use designations that dominate the planning area. Pockets of open space, including the Motte-Rimrock Reserve and Steele Peak, are designated as Open Space Conservation Habitat to preserve their scenic and natural qualities. (DEIR, p. 3-43.)

A Rural Village Overlay is designated along a portion of the present alignment of the SR-74, which is located in the southern portion of the planning area. The Rural Village would serve as a focal point for the surrounding Good Hope community. This special overlay designation allows for a mixture of local serving commercial uses, educational, recreational/cultural opportunities, and limited residential development at a higher density than the underlying land use. The Land

Use Element provides a further description of this land use designation and its intent. (DEIR, p. 3-43.)

Mobility within the open space system is not ignored, either. Multi-use trails are conceptually located throughout the planning area, providing the framework for future trail improvements and connections. Thus, there is a strong relationship in the Area Plan between land uses and associated transportation and mobility systems, no matter what the intensity of uses may be. (DEIR, p. 3-43.)

The Pass Area Plan

The Pass Area Plan generally reflects the predominantly rural character of the unincorporated area. The considerable amount of natural open space historically provided by Riverside County plans over the years within the Pass is maintained. Most of the proposed development within the Pass remains focused within the cities. (DEIR, p. 3-43.)

Cherry Valley and the Banning Bench generally maintain their rural character, although Cherry Valley would continue its focus around an existing retail and service-oriented community core on Beaumont Avenue. Cabazon retains its tourist identity along Interstate 10 (I-10), as well as its existing residential and desert-oriented uses. The rugged terrain, open space, and scenic qualities of the San Bernardino and San Jacinto Mountains that are so prominent in the area would continue to be preserved through the Rural Mountainous, Open Space, and Rural land use designations. A Mixed Use Planning Area is provided within the Oak Valley Specific Plan (SP 318) and a Community Center Overlay is provided in Cabazon. (DEIR, p. 3-43.)

Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan

The primary purpose of this Area Plan is to preserve the remote, rural nature of the Reche Canyon/Badlands area. Slope, habitat and other natural constraints severely limit opportunities to provide substantial areas for population or employment growth. Conservation of habitat, preservation of existing rural communities, and provision of areas for lower density residential areas in keeping with the rural character of the planning area are the primary objectives of this Area Plan. (DEIR, p. 3-43.)

The Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan designates much of the land in the northern portion of the planning area as Rural Mountainous and Open Space Rural, in keeping with the mountainous character of the region. Very Low Density Residential, Estate Density Residential and Rural Residential designations are generally applied to areas adjacent to the City of Moreno Valley and along some of the area's major roadway corridors, including San Timoteo Canyon Road, Gilman

Springs Road, Reche Canyon Road, and Pigeon Pass Road. Open space areas for the preservation of publicly owned habitat and park land are designated for the Lake Perris State Recreational Area, the San Jacinto Wildlife Reserve, the Norton Younglove Reserve, and the Box Springs Mountains Reserve. Areas designated for Agriculture uses are located adjacent to the San Jacinto Wildlife Reserve. The Riverside County Badlands Landfill facility is designated for Public Facility use. Additional areas have been designated for Open Space Mining, Open Space Recreation, and Commercial Tourist, primarily reflecting those corresponding existing uses. (DEIR, p. 3-51.)

Riverside Extended Mountain Area Plan

The majority of the Riverside Extended Mountain Area Plan (REMAP) lies within Rural and Open Space Foundation Components. The amount of acreage already under public ownership (i.e., U.S. Forest Service, State of California, Bureau of Land Management) together with the constraints imposed by natural hazards, remoteness, and lack of infrastructure, preclude significant new growth in most of the area. Opportunities for expansion are provided for the rural communities of Anza and Aguanga. (DEIR, p. 3-51.)

Rural Village Overlays have been applied in strategic locations. These overlays allow a focused community core providing a mixture (however limited) of urban-type services and Community Development or Rural Community land uses complementing and blending with the natural environment and reinforcing existing community character. (DEIR, p. 3-51.)

Scattered rural residential areas are also present in the planning area, usually consisting of large lot residential homes with limited utilities and community services. REMAP reflects the desire by these communities to maintain the lifestyle currently associated with this predominantly remote and rugged territory. Limited development would be focused in established communities according to policies and guidelines that would sustain the special character of these places. (DEIR, p. 3-51.)

San Jacinto Valley Area Plan

The Area Plan is designed to maintain the predominantly rural, agrarian, and open space character of the unincorporated portions of the San Jacinto Valley and to focus growth in ways that respect the existing urban fabric, slope, and natural hazard considerations. This is accomplished by providing an opportunity for community development in the East Hemet and Valle Vista areas, by preserving selected natural features (especially riparian), and protecting residents from natural hazards. (DEIR, p. 3-51.)

The East Hemet and Valle Vista areas are a mix of Very Low, Low, Medium, Medium High and High Density Residential development. Commercial and office uses dominate along Florida Avenue. This area steps down in density to Agriculture, Rural-Mountainous, and Open Space-

Conservation designated areas. San Jacinto Valley contains numerous significant natural features and hazards. Land near the San Jacinto River in the northern portion of the plan is severely constrained for development due to steep slopes, the 100-year floodplain, dam inundation hazards, seismic zones, and existing habitat. As such, most of the area within the flood plain along the river (except existing dairies) is designated as Open Space-Conservation. A large area between Gilman Hot Springs Road and the River is under single ownership and is depicted as a Mixed Use Planning Area. The truly limited development potential on the steep, inaccessible slopes of the San Jacinto Mountains is also recognized by the Open Space-Conservation designation. (DEIR, pp. 3-51, 3-57.)

This Area Plan has several constraints and benefits. Severely constrained lands subject to natural hazards are slated primarily for preservation. Community separators and greenbelts are provided by many of these conservation oriented designations. Finally, Community Development land uses are generally focused on areas adjacent to the existing urban fabric, while rural, agriculture and open space uses lie on the periphery. (DEIR, p. 3-57.)

Southwest Area Plan

The Southwest Area Plan Land Use Plan generally reflects the predominantly rural character of the area. In fact, most of the Southwest Area Plan is devoted to Open Space, Agricultural, and Rural designations. The remaining area is devoted to a variety of urban uses. Most of this urban development is focused in French Valley and easterly of the City of Temecula along SR-79 East. By concentrating development patterns in this manner, future growth would be accommodated, and the unique rural and agricultural lifestyle found elsewhere in the Southwest Area Plan would be maintained. For the most part, the Open Space and Rural designations are applied in the mountains and foothills surrounding the Cities of Murrieta and Temecula. The Agricultural designation is largely applied to the Citrus / Vineyard area east of Temecula. (DEIR, p. 3-57.)

The Santa Rosa Ecological Reserve, the Cleveland National Forest, and Vail Lake are designated for open space uses to reflect the rich and significant habitat these areas provide. Glen Oaks Hills and the Santa Rosa Plateau are designated for rural uses to maintain the existing rural residential character of these areas. These Open Space, Agricultural, and Rural area plan land use designations reflect the existing and intended long-term land use patterns for these areas and help maintain the historic identity and character of the Southwest Area Plan. Such designations also provide an edge to urban development and a separation between the adjoining area plans and San Diego County. This edge strengthens the identity of the Southwest Area Plan and helps to distinguish it from other communities. (DEIR, p. 3-57.)

Future growth is largely accommodated northeast of the existing Cities of Temecula and Murrieta in the French Valley. Proposed land uses reflect, or are influenced by, adopted specific plans. These specific plans depict a largely residential community with local-serving commercial and employment uses located along the major roadways. The residential community

is focused around SR-79 North (Winchester Road). Within that residential pattern the French Valley Airport acts as a hub for surrounding business and industrial park development, which contributes significantly to an employment and economic focus for the Southwest Area Plan. SR-79 North is the chief circulation route in the valley other than the I-15 and I-215 freeways. The adjacent areas accommodate regional uses and a large segment of potential commercial development. Despite this rather focused development, significant watercourses in the valley are maintained in adopted and proposed specific plans through open space designations. This stream system is depicted on the Southwest Area Plan Land Use Plan as Watercourse and associated Open Space designations. The Southwest Area Plan includes a Community Center Overlay southerly of Scott Road and westerly of SR-79 North, and a Mixed Use Planning Area on the north side of Murrieta Hot Springs Road, easterly of SR-79 North. (DEIR, p. 3-57.)

Sun City/Menifee Valley Area Plan

The Sun City/Menifee Valley Area Plan reflects much of the existing Community Plan. To the extent possible, Community Development areas extend outward from the existing urbanized community areas. Furthermore, an effort is made, wherever existing and already approved land uses permit, to enhance existing concentrations of activity and distinguish them from other concentrations in and around the Area Plan. (DEIR, p. 3-61.)

For example, a Rural Mountainous designation in the northeast quadrant separates the McCall corridor from the developed Menifee Village north of Newport Road. The McCall corridor is anchored by Commercial Retail and Business Park designations near I-215, with Commercial Office, and Medium and Medium High Density Residential designations to the east. (DEIR, p. 3-61.)

Light Industrial uses along the north edge of the Plan Area both east and west of I-215 relate to transportation corridors, including a rail corridor along the diagonal edge of the Area Plan in the north. To the west of I-215, the Medium Density Residential designation extends the character of the existing Sun City development toward the edges of the Plan. At that point, a Rural Mountainous designation sets Quail Valley, with its rural character, apart from Sun City. The potential for Commercial Retail development serving Quail Valley is recognized along Goetz Road, allowing for a different scale of focus in keeping with the needs of this specialized community. (DEIR, p. 3-61.)

Both the channelized and natural portions of Salt Creek are designated Open Space-Recreation to allow the potential for the channel to serve both flood control and recreation purposes. This dominant feature offers another opportunity to distinguish development sectors from each other. Residential subdivisions characterize the area south of Salt Creek along Newport Road. Medium, Medium High, and High Density Residential designations dominate here, together with Commercial Retail. Farther south, the Area Plan diverges from the existing Community Plan in its provision for Community Center Overlays both easterly and westerly of I-215 and in its

expansion of Medium Density Residential designations in the southwest and southeast Menifee Valley. (DEIR, p. 3-61.)

Temescal Area Plan

Open Space Foundation Component land uses comprise most of the unincorporated planning area in the Temescal Area Plan. The Cleveland National Forest and Prado Basin account for much of this acreage. This emphasizes the importance of the remaining land area to house and employ the existing population, to accommodate the growth pressures in Western Riverside County, to respect local interests, as well as observe hazard and circulation constraints. (DEIR, p. 3-61.)

The Area Plan focuses on preserving the integrity of existing communities and preserving irreplaceable open space resources, while recognizing this area's transition to urban uses by stimulating targeted infill development, as well as redevelopment projects. The land use plan also focuses on achieving a more balanced relationship between workers and jobs, offering options to the prevailing extended commute patterns to coastal job centers. (DEIR, p. 3-61.)

The Cleveland National Forest, as a priceless, natural open space resource area, is generally treated as a permanent open space preserve, with the exception of a few large-lot residential areas reflecting current uses or approved development. The Prado Basin will remain a significant habitat area and critical piece of the Santa Ana River Watershed, with its numerous critical functions in support of development within four counties. (DEIR, p. 3-61.)

Land use designations and policies maintain the general urban character of Coronita and Home Gardens and the low and very low density residential character of El Cerrito. The I-15 corridor represents the greatest opportunity for community development while achieving the RCIP objectives. Residential and employment uses would continue to be focused within this corridor through the extensive, though not exclusive, use of specific plans. Preserving the Temescal Wash, enhancing local and regional traffic conditions along I-15, and achieving a satisfactory interface with mineral extraction operations are of utmost importance in the guidance for this strategic area. The Community Center designation at Temescal Canyon Road and I-15 would provide a focused area for the development of a Job Center comprised of light industrial and business-park uses with supporting retail services. (DEIR, p. 3-67.)

Desert Center Area Plan

The Desert Center Land Use Plan generally reflects the very limited development potential here. The vast majority of land uses within the Area Plan are designated Open Space-Rural. These lands are generally remote, inaccessible, subject to natural hazards, or unable to support development due to the lack of facilities and necessary services for accommodating

development. The uninhabited and natural character of the open space lands is expected to continue throughout the life of the plan. (DEIR, p. 3-67.)

Agricultural production areas are identified with the Agriculture land use designation. Land uses within the Community Development Foundation Component comprise only a small percentage of the total acreage within the planning area. Future development should be focused on infill and redevelopment of the existing communities at Desert Center, Lake Tamarisk, and Eagle Mountain. The distinct community separation between the highway commercial uses and the Lake Tamarisk community should be maintained. The Eagle Mountain landfill and townsite are designated to accommodate the proposed Class III non-hazardous waste landfill and nearby housing and services for its workers and their families. (DEIR, p. 3-67.)

Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan

The Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan is designed to maintain the predominantly rural, agricultural, and open space character of the Eastern Coachella Valley, while allowing for potential development in Vista Santa Rosa and around Thermal and Mecca. The plan integrates the existing urban fabric together with slope and natural hazard considerations. Importantly, the plan seeks to retain the agricultural practices and lands in the area that are so intrinsic to the character of this area and important to the County's economy. (DEIR, p. 3-67.)

The majority of the area within the Salton Trough, surrounding the Salton Sea to the west and stretching north toward the City of Coachella, is designated Agriculture. The majority of the area east of the All-American Canal is designated Open Space-Conservation Habitat and Open Space-Rural to reflect the area's remoteness and lack of services. (DEIR, p. 3-67.)

In the Thermal area, the actual planned extent of the Light Industrial uses adjacent to the airport is depicted on the land use plan. Higher density residential designations have been shown easterly of the airport that more correctly reflect the existing and potential land use. (DEIR, p. 3-73.)

Opportunities for Commercial Tourist development are shown around the State Route 111/State Route 86 (SR-111/SR-86) intersection. Areas of potential residential development have been expanded around Mecca. Commercial Tourist designations are also located adjacent to the Salton Sea, south of SR-111, and are intended to capitalize on the scenic and recreational opportunities of both the Salton Sea and the surrounding desert area. Location of such areas near the community of North Shore allows for contiguous development in an effort to preserve the area's natural attributes and assets. The plan provides for a Community Center on 40 acres in Mecca and allows for one in Vista Santa Rosa. (DEIR, p. 3-73.)

Palo Verde Area Plan

The eastern portion of the Palo Verde Area Plan is intended to preserve the agricultural character and the rich economic base of the Palo Verde Valley. Development patterns here are limited to areas along of I-10 and corridors along north / south roadways, a few small pockets adjacent to the City of Blythe, and the community of Ripley. The Area Plan also allows for limited development of appropriately designed recreational resorts along the Colorado River to respond to expanded tourist and recreational draw. (DEIR, p. 3-73.)

The western half of the Area Plan maintains the sparsely populated, rugged desert and mountain character of the Palo Verde Mesa. There is some potential for limited commercial uses at the intersection of I-10 and Wiley's Well Road, which is the main access to the prisons. Blythe Airport is accommodated and enhanced to provide an economic magnet with the inclusion of the Business Park and Commercial Retail land use designations. The Nicholls Warm Springs/Mesa Verde community is accommodated immediately south of the airport. (DEIR, p. 3-73.)

Western Coachella Valley Area Plan

The Western Coachella Valley Area Plan ranges in character from suburban style development found in Bermuda Dunes, Thousand Palms, and Sun City, to remote rural enclaves such as Sky Valley and Indio Hills, to the wind energy area southerly of Desert Hot Springs, to the outlying mountainous and desert terrain typical of Eastern Riverside County. The Area Plan seeks to maintain the character of these areas, while allowing additional urban development in areas adjacent to the I-10 corridor and preserving the desert character of the Valley's remote desert and mountainous areas. (DEIR, p. 3-73.)

The Area Plan proposes a mix of lower density residential land uses ranging from Rural Residential to Medium Density Residential uses near urban centers, except along Washington Street and Avenue 42 in Bermuda Dunes, which will continue to provide for areas of High Density Residential development. (DEIR, p. 3-77.)

Ample land exists within Coachella Valley cities to accommodate most of the residential and commercial growth through the year 2040. The Area Plan focuses Community Development land uses, including residential, commercial and industrial uses, along Interstate 10 and the Pierson Boulevard and Dillon Road corridors, while maintaining a mix of urban uses in Bermuda Dunes, Sun City, and Thousand Palms. (DEIR, p. 3-77.)

The Western Coachella Valley Area Plan identifies the area within the sphere of influence of the City of Rancho Mirage as having significant development potential, due in large part to the area's centralized Valley location, proximity to I-10, and large amount of vacant land, much of which is Indian-owned. This Area Plan creates a policy area designed to establish policies and

guidelines for development in this area, in concert with a joint planning effort involving the City of Rancho Mirage and the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. (DEIR, p. 3-77.)

Also identified within this Area Plan is the location of a Rural Village within the community of Sky Valley. With the Rural Village Overlay designation on the Area Plan, this village is designed to allow for a concentration of rural residential uses, a small neighborhood commercial center, public, and open space uses, thus allowing Sky Valley residents access to localized commercial and public services. (DEIR, p. 3-77.)

Much of the Western Coachella Valley area is designated for rural and open space uses. These uses separate Community Development areas, creating distinct community edges and enhancing community identity. Open space areas for habitat conservation occupy almost 25 percent of the total unincorporated area. These areas are predominant in the SR-74/Santa Rosa Mountains area south of Palm Desert and Indian Wells, along the eastern edge of the San Gorgonio Pass north and south of I-10, and north of Desert Hot Springs, throughout the Indio Hills and Coachella Valley Preserve, and areas east of Dillon Road. (DEIR, p. 3-77.)

Modifications to Zoning District Boundaries

Concurrent with the proposed General Plan, Riverside County proposes to modify the boundaries of existing zoning districts to correspond to the Area Plan boundaries contained in the proposed General Plan. Zoning Districts are a means used by Riverside County to organize its zoning maps. Whereas small and medium-sized cities, such as those within Riverside County, can typically display zoning throughout their jurisdictions on a single map, the County's large size (7,200 square miles) means that zoning must be presented on several different maps for zoning designations on individual properties to be readable. Each of these individual maps is identified as a zoning district area. (DEIR, p. 3-77.)

The actions proposed by Riverside County would reorganize the individual zoning maps (zoning districts) to correspond to the Area Plan boundaries proposed in the General Plan. If approved, the boundaries of individual zoning maps (zoning districts) would be coterminous with the General Plan's Area Plan boundaries. (DEIR, p. 3-77.)

Although the County does not propose to change the existing zoning of any individual property at this time, because each zoning district was adopted by separate ordinances by the County Board of Supervisors, modification of zoning district boundaries requires a discretionary action to be taken by the Board of Supervisors, even if zoning designations on individual properties are not affected by the County's action. As a result, the proposed modification of zoning district

boundaries constitutes a “project” under CEQA, requiring environmental documentation. (DEIR, p. 3-81.)

As stated previously, although the County does not propose to change the existing zoning of any individual property at this time, state law requires zoning to be consistent with the General Plan. Therefore, there will be changes to zoning subsequent to General Plan adoption. (DEIR, p. 3-81.)

V.
BACKGROUND

Environmental Review Process

To further the basic purposes of CEQA, the environmental review process requires the preparation and public circulation of several documents. These include, in addition to the General Plan Program EIR, a Notice of Preparation (NOP), and an Initial Study (IS). An NOP is a brief notice that the Lead Agency plans to prepare an EIR for a project. The purpose of the NOP is to solicit guidance from agencies and individuals as to the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the EIR. (DEIR, p. 2-6.)

Riverside County formally initiated the environmental process with circulation of an NOP, which was sent to responsible agencies and interested individuals for a 30-day review period from May 28, 2002 to June 30, 2002. An IS for the proposed General Plan was presented to the public on May 28, 2002 and circulated with the NOP. If, as here, it is known that an EIR will be prepared, an IS, although not required, is helpful in identifying the likely potential environmental impacts that should be studied in the EIR. The full range of potential environmental effects associated with the implementation of the General Plan, as identified in the IS, is contained in Appendix A to the FEIR. (DEIR, p. 2-6.)

The IS (Environmental Assessment No. 38614) prepared for the proposed General Plan identified potential environmental impacts related to the following issues:

- | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| C | Aesthetics | C | Land Use and Planning |
| C | Agricultural Resources | C | Mineral Resources |
| C | Air Quality | C | Noise |
| C | Biological Resources | C | Population and Housing |
| C | Cultural Resources | C | Public Services |
| C | Geology and Soils | C | Recreation |
| C | Hazards and Hazardous Materials | C | Transportation/Traffic |
| C | Hydrology and Water Quality | C | Utilities and Service Systems |

Based on the IS, it was determined that potential impacts associated with the aforementioned issues required further evaluation in the Program EIR for the proposed General Plan. Additionally, the IS determined that an evaluation of potential cumulative impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan be included in the EIR. (DEIR, p. 1-5.)

In compliance with CEQA Guidelines, the County of Riverside has taken steps to optimize opportunities to participate in the environmental process. During the preparation of the Draft EIR, various Federal, State, regional, and local government agencies, and other interested parties were contacted to solicit comments and to inform the public of the proposed General Plan. Two public scoping meetings were held to solicit public comment on the General Plan EIR. Public comments made at the two public scoping meetings are summarized in Section 1.3.1 of the DEIR. (DEIR, p. 1-12.) Additionally, several individuals and agencies sent written comments in response to the NOP. Those comments are summarized in Section 1.3 of the DEIR. (DEIR, pp. 1-6 through 1-11.)

Incorporation By Reference

As stated in Section 15150 of the State CEQA Guidelines, “An EIR or negative declaration may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document which is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public.” Section 15150, subdivision (b) further states that all documents incorporated by reference shall be made available to the public for inspection at a public place or public building and requires that the EIR state where the incorporated documents will be made available for public inspection. Section 15150, subdivision (d) requires that the EIR include the state identification number of any previous EIR or negative declaration which has been incorporated by reference. The following document has been incorporated by reference: Riverside County Integrated Plan (RCIP) Existing Setting Report (LSA Associates, March 2000). (DEIR, p. 2-4.)

The RCIP is intended to provide a common factual basis for the preparation of the three components of the County’s integrated planning effort: Riverside County General Plan, Western Riverside County MSHCP, and the Western Riverside County CETAP. This report also provides a single environmental baseline inventory that will be used in the preparation of subsequent environmental documents for each of the three plans comprising the RCIP. (DEIR, p. 2-4.)

The RCIP presents the results of an intensive research effort aimed at identifying the physical, social, and economic characteristics of Riverside County which need to be understood in order to formulate goals, objectives, and policies for the integrated planning effort. (DEIR, p. 2-4.)

VI.
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For the purposes of CEQA, and the findings herein set forth, the administrative record for the Project consists of those items listed in Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e). The record of proceedings for the Board's decision on the Project consists of the following documents, at a minimum:

- The Riverside County Integrated Plan (RCIP) Existing Setting Report (LSA Associates, March 2000);
- The NOP (May 2002) and all other public notices issued by the County in conjunction with the Project;
- The Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2002 Riverside County General Plan and Technical Appendices (August 2002);
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the 45-day comment period on the Draft EIR (August 20, 2002 through October 4, 2002);
- All comments and correspondence submitted to the County with respect to the Project, in addition to timely comments on the Draft EIR;
- The Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2002 Riverside County General Plan, including comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments, and technical appendices (March 2003);
- The mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the Project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the Board in connection with the 2002 Riverside County General Plan project, and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the County, consultants to the County, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the County's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the County's action on the 2002 Riverside County General Plan;
- All documents submitted to the County (including the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors) by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the 2002 Riverside County General Plan, up through the close of the public hearing on July 1, 2003;

- Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the County in connection with the 2002 Riverside County General Plan;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the County at such information sessions, public meetings and public hearings;
- All resolutions adopted by the County regarding the 2002 Riverside County General Plan, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions;
- Matters of common knowledge to the County, including, but not limited to Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and
- Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The official custodian of the record is the Clerk of the Riverside County Board of Supervisors, 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, California 92501.

VII.
MITIGATION MONITORING
AND REPORTING PROGRAMS

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs ("MMRPs") were prepared for the Project, and were approved by the Board of Supervisors by the same resolution that has adopted these findings. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15097.) The County will use the MMRPs to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The MMRPs will remain available for public review during the compliance period. This program is found in Section 4.0 of the Final EIR, which is incorporated by reference into this exhibit (Mitigation Monitoring Plan).

VIII.

TIERING AND THE USE OF A PROGRAM EIR

Program EIRs are typically prepared for an agency plan program, or series of actions that can be characterized as one large project, such as a general plan. Tiering refers to the concept of a multilevel approach to preparing environmental documents (CEQA Guidelines, § 15152). A General Plan EIR, addressing the impacts of countywide and local policy decisions, can be thought of as a “first tier” document. It evaluates the large-scale impacts on the environment that can be expected to result from the adoption of the General Plan, but does not necessarily address the site-specific impacts that each of the individual development projects that will follow and implement the General Plan may have. CEQA requires each of those subsequent development projects be evaluated for their particular site-specific impacts. These site-specific analyses are typically encompassed in second-tier documents, such as Project EIRs, Focused EIRs, or Negative Declarations on individual development projects subject to the General Plan, which typically evaluate the impacts of a single activity undertaken to implement the overall plan. (DEIR, p. 2-2; FEIR pp. 3-4 to 3-5.)

According to the CEQA Guidelines, a State or local agency should prepare a Program EIR, rather than a Project EIR, when the lead agency proposes the following:

- Series of related actions that are linked geographically;
- Logical parts of a chain of contemplated events, rules, regulations, or plans that govern the conduct of a continuing program; or
- Individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways.

(CEQA Guidelines, § 15168, subd. (a).) (DEIR, p. 2-2.)

In this case, the Program EIR addresses the General Plan, which is the proposed Project. The FEIR anticipates a series of actions needed to achieve the implementation of the proposed General Plan. Further actions or procedures required to allow implementation of the proposed General Plan include the processing of zoning plans, specific plans, tentative tract maps, site design plans, building permits, and grading permits. (DEIR, p. 2-2; FEIR, p.3-5.)

In a Program EIR, CEQA allows the general analysis of broad environmental effects of the program with the acknowledgment that subsequent site-specific environmental review may be required for particular aspects of portions of the program at the time of project implementation. The Program EIR serves a valuable purpose as a first-tier environmental analysis. The Program EIR can be incorporated by reference into subsequently prepared environmental documents to address issues, such as cumulative impacts and growth inducing impacts, allowing the subsequent documents to focus on new or site-specific impacts (CEQA Guidelines, § 151168, subd. (d)). (DEIR, pp. 2-2 to 2-3.)

Although the legally required contents of a Program EIR are the same as those of a Project EIR, in practice there are considerable differences in level of detail. Program EIRs are typically more conceptual and abstract. They contain a more general discussion of impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures. (DEIR, p. 2-3.)

To keep the analysis of impacts in this Program EIR in perspective, the County of Riverside is approximately the size of the State of New Jersey (approximately 7,295 square miles). It includes well-established urban, suburban, and rural communities. It has an extensive array of agricultural lands, lands devoted to mineral extraction, and recreational areas. There are rugged mountains, flat valley areas, open desert, and expansive natural open space areas. The variety of geographic zones has an influence on climate which, in turn, affects biodiversity, energy usage (for air conditioning and heating), water usage (for agriculture and landscaping), wild fire hazards, flood hazards, air quality (heat, wind patterns, topography), water quality (natural salinity), and soil types (prime farmland) within the County. In addition, the County contains vast expanses of federal and Native American lands and 24 incorporated cities that are not under the land use control of the County. The analysis in a Program EIR for a county this size is not intended to be site-specific (e.g., determining the level of service for intersections within the County), but is a more broad analysis. For instance, the traffic analysis determines whether the roadway widths proposed in the General Plan Circulation Element will accommodate the planned land uses. The Program EIR does not, however, determine fair share roadway improvements for individual future development projects. These fair share improvements that development will be responsible to build or pay for will be determined during subsequent environmental review on a case-by-case basis. (DEIR, p. 2-3.)

Therefore, the Program EIR will help determine the need for subsequent environmental documentation. Parameters by which a lead agency can determine the need for additional environmental documentation are contained in the CEQA Guidelines. (See CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15160 to 15170.) (DEIR, p. 2-3.)

IX.
GROWTH INDUCEMENT

CEQA requires a discussion of the ways in which the proposed General Plan could be growth inducing. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2, subdivision (d), identifies a project as growth inducing if it fosters economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. New employees from commercial and industrial development and new population from residential development represent direct forms of growth. These direct forms of growth have a secondary effect of expanding the size of local markets and inducing additional economic activity in the area. Examples of development that would indirectly facilitate growth include the installation of new roadways or the construction or expansion of water delivery/treatment facilities. (DEIR, p. 5-6.)

Section 5.3 of the DEIR provides a discussion of growth inducing impacts of the General Plan. As discussed in that section, the proposed General Plan would result in growth. Based on the definition of growth inducement, a General Plan is inherently growth inducing. Moreover, the growth permitted by the proposed General Plan leads to significant unavoidable adverse impacts. The proposed General Plan is a master plan providing the framework by which public officials will be guided on making decisions relative to development within Riverside County. However, it is the implementation of land use policies that will incrementally increase demands for public services, utilities, and infrastructure, and the need for medical, educational, and recreation facilities. (DEIR, p. 5-8.)

X.
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

“Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15355, subd. (b).) Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR include a discussion of the potential cumulative impacts of a proposed project. Cumulative impacts are defined as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15355.) “The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable or probable future projects.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15355, subd. (b).)

The cumulative discussion in the EIR for the 2002 Riverside County General Plan analyzed the cumulative effects of the entire RCIP, including the proposed General Plan, the proposed Western Riverside County MSHCP and the proposed CETAP. Even though the MSHCP and the CETAP are undergoing separate environmental documentation, they were considered as foreseeable future projects as a part of the actions of the County. In addition, the cumulative analysis considered the build out of not only the proposed General Plan, but the build out of all incorporated cities within the County. (DEIR, p. 5-10.)

Cumulative impacts were analyzed in Section 5.4 of the FEIR. (DEIR, pp. 5-8 to 5-17.) Of the 19 identified significant cumulative impacts, three were identified as significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, pp. 5-11 to 5-17.) These impacts include the loss of Prime, Unique, or Statewide Important agricultural lands, air quality, biological resources. (DEIR, pp. 5-11 to 5-13.) Section XIII, *infra*, of these Findings addresses each impact individually.

XI.

SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Section 5.2 of the DEIR examined “significant irreversible environmental effects.” Approval and implementation of actions related to the proposed General Plan would result in an irretrievable commitment of non-renewable resources such as energy supplies and other construction related materials. The energy resource demands would be used for construction, heating and cooling of buildings, transportation of people and goods, heating and refrigeration, lighting, and other associated energy needs. (DEIR, p. 5-5.)

Environmental changes with implementation of the proposed General Plan would occur as the physical environment is altered through continued commitments of land and construction materials to urban and rural development. There would be an irretrievable commitment of labor, capital, and materials used in construction and a permanent loss of open space. Nonrenewable resources would be committed primarily in the form of fossil fuels and would include fuel, oil, natural gas, and gasoline used by vehicles and equipment associated with implementation of the proposed General Plan. (DEIR, p. 5-5.)

The consumption of other non-renewable or slowly renewable resources would result from the development of the proposed General Plan. These resources would include, but not be limited to, lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, steel, copper, lead, and water. Because alternative energy sources such as solar, geothermal, or wind energy are not currently in widespread local use, it is unlikely that real savings in non-renewable energy supplies (e.g., oil and gas) could be realized in the immediate future. (DEIR, p. 5-5.)

Development within Riverside County as envisioned by the proposed General Plan would result in the construction of structures, facilities, and/or infrastructure on lands that are currently undeveloped. Development of lands would generally result in their future and permanent commitment to urban uses. (DEIR, p. 5-5.)

XII.

CONSISTENCY WITH REGIONAL PLANS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15125, subdivision (d), requires that any inconsistencies between a regionally significant project and regional plans be discussed. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) regional plans cover the proposed project area and five other counties in Southern California. SCAG's regional plans that require a consistency discussion are the Regional Comprehensive Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan administered by SCAG. (DEIR, p. 5-17.) The proposed General Plan is consistent with these two plans, as discussed in Sections 5.5.1 and 5.5.2 of the DEIR, and as noted by SCAG in its comments on the DEIR. (DEIR, p. 5-24; FEIR, pp. 2-131 to 2-132.)

Consistency with applicable Air Quality Management Plans and Air Quality Attainment Plans, as well as the air quality State Implementation Plan, is discussed in Section 4.5 of the DEIR. (DEIR, pp. 4.5-26.) Consistency with applicable Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans is discussed in Sections 4.2 and 4.6. (DEIR, pp. 4.2-11, 4.6-18, 4.6-30.) Section 4.2 also contains an analysis of consistency with relevant Airport Land Use Plans and Riverside County LAFCO policies. (DEIR, pp. 4.2-12 to 4.2-14.) The DEIR concluded that through its proposed policies, implementation of those policies, and mitigation measures, the proposed General Plan is consistent with all of these plans. (See DEIR, pp. 4.2-11 to 4.2-14, 4.5-26, 4.6-30.)

Furthermore, on May 22, 2003, the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) voted unanimously to certify that the new Riverside County General Plan is consistent with the Airport Land Use Plan, provided that certain policy revisions were included to ensure consistency and to improve the General Plan's system of identifying and resolving potential airport land use conflicts. The proposed policy revisions were included in Exhibit I, Final Changes to the RCIP General Plan Amendment No. 618, Land Use Management Agency's Submittal to the Board of Supervisors, dated October 7, 2003, and approved by the Board on October 7, 2003.

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES □
(chart follows this page) □
(page 42 of this document begins immediately following Page 77 of the chart)

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
----------------------	--	---	------------------

4.2 Land Use/Agricultural Resources

<i>Land Use</i>			
<p>4.2.1 <i>Implementation of the proposed General Plan would alter the amount of land designated for community development, rural, and open space uses. Changes in the pattern of land uses would result in the development of structures or facilities within areas that are currently undeveloped. Relative to adjacent land uses, this intensification of development may contribute to or create significant land use impacts.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: LU1.1-1.4, LU 2.1, LU 3.1-3.5, LU 6.1, LU 6.3-6.5, LU 17.4, LU 22.6, and LU 26.10</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>A main purpose of the proposed General Plan is to ensure future development follows a consistent and orderly pattern. As development occurs, it would be required to be consistent with the goals and policies of the proposed General Plan. The proposed General Plan policies will ensure compliance with the proposed General Plan and provide for the implementation of measures to buffer adjacent uses from potentially adverse impacts of neighboring uses. These measures include the use of buffering, setbacks and design features to ensure compatibility between adjacent uses and to mitigate/minimize potential impacts. (DEIR, p. 4.2-20.)</p> <p>The Board therefore finds that implementation of proposed General Plan Land Use Policies 1.1-1.4 , 2.1, 3.1-3.5, 6.1, 6.3-6.5, 17.4, 22.6, and 26.10, will reduce potential impacts associated with the alteration of land use designations to a less than significant level. The Board finds that no additional mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impacts to land use, see DEIR, Section 4.2.3, pp. 4.2-14 to 4.2-20.</p>

Agriculture

<p>4.2.2 <i>The proposed General Plan update will result in the conversion of prime farmlands, unique farmlands, farmland of statewide importance or land actively</i></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Policies: LU 16.1-16.2, LU 16.4-16.11, and OS 7.1-7.5.</p> <p>4.2.2A The County shall establish an Agricultural Land Mitigation Bank. The formation, authority, and operation shall be</p>	<p>While the implementation of proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures would help reduce the conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses, the potential loss of Prime, Unique, or Statewide Important farmland remains a significant unavoidable impact. Mitigation measures 4.2.2A, 4.2.2B (proposed in the DEIR, and revised pursuant to comments received from Sierra Club), and 4.2.2C (proposed in response to comments received</p>
---	-----------	--	--

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
----------------------	--	---	------------------

<p><i>utilized for agricultural production to a variety of non-agricultural uses.</i></p>		<p>established by the County of Riverside and shall adhere to applicable statutes of the State of California and Riverside County. The Agriculture Land Mitigation Bank shall be established no later than two years from the date of adoption of the 2002 Riverside County General Plan.</p> <p>4.2.2B Subsequent to the establishment of an Agricultural Land Mitigation Bank, any development within any unincorporated area of the County resulting in the conversion of more than 80 acres of Prime, Unique, or Statewide Important farmland (designated farmland) as designated by the most recent version of the Important Farmland Map (as prepared by the California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program) shall purchase credits in the Agricultural Land Mitigation Bank at the rate of 1 acre (credit) for every four acres (or portion thereof) of designated farmland converted to non-agricultural uses. The 80-acre threshold shall be met by any combination of designated farmland. All designated farmland within a project site shall be included in the threshold computation, regardless of the size, location within the project site, or current status (fallow or farmed). Development applications received by the County prior to operational date of the Agricultural Land Mitigation Bank shall be exempt from the provisions of this mitigation.</p>	<p>from Sierra Club), will reduce, but not avoid, the adverse effect associated with this impact. (See DEIR, pp. 4.2-20 to 4.2-24; FEIR, pp. 2-186 to 2-187, 2-229 to 2-230.) Therefore, the Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The Board finds that there are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that the Board could adopt at this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact, therefore, remains significant and unmitigable. To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less-than-significant) level, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project as modified by the adopted mitigation measures, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project's significant and unavoidable impacts to prime farmland, see DEIR, Section 4.2.3, pp. 4.2-20 to 4.2-24; section 5.1.2, p. 5-2, and section 5.4, pp. 5-11 to 5-12.</p>
---	--	---	--

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
----------------------	--	---	------------------

		<p>In determining the amount of farmland converted to non-agricultural use, the total effect of the development shall be considered, including the total amount of farmland within the limits of the project site and any off-site land directly required for the construction and operation of the proposed development.</p> <p>The project proponent shall submit evidence to the County that all appropriate credits have been purchased prior to the issuance of grading permits.</p> <p>4.2.2C Subsequent to the establishment of an Agricultural Land Mitigation Bank, any development within unincorporated Riverside County resulting in the conversion of more than 40 acres of land actively utilized for agricultural production (active farmland), shall purchase credits in the Agricultural Land Mitigation Bank at the rate of one acre (credit) for every acre (or portion thereof) of active farmland converted to non-agricultural uses. To be considered “active farmland,” land must have been utilized for agricultural production for two of the previous five years (prior to application). The 40-acre threshold shall be met only by the footprint of land on which crops are grown or livestock raised regardless of whether the land is State designated or not, and shall not include roadways, residential or production areas, equipment storage areas, or</p>	
--	--	---	--

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
----------------------	--	---	------------------

		other non-production areas:	
--	--	-----------------------------	--

4.4 Aesthetics/Visual Resources

<p>4.4.1. <i>The proposed General Plan would increase the development of urban uses, causing a substantial loss in open space and aesthetic resources. This could significantly alter existing and future public views and view corridors, which include State and County designated Scenic Highways.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: LU 2.1, LU 4.1, LU 8.1, LU 8.3-8.4, LU 11.1, LU 13.1-13.8, LU 16.1, LU 17.1, LU 17.3, LU 17.6, LU 19.4, LU 21.2, LU 22.10, LU 22.11, LU 26.1, LU 26.3, LU 26.10, LU 26.11, OS 21.1, OS 21.2, OS 21.22, and OS 22.1-22.5.</p> <p>4.4.1A Development projects shall be subject to the requirements of all relevant guidelines, including the community center guidelines (Appendix J of the proposed General Plan), Riverside County supervisorial district design and landscape guidelines, and all applicable standards, policies, guidelines, and/or regulations of the County of Riverside or other affected entities pertaining to scenic vistas/aesthetic resources. Factors considered in these guidelines include the scale, extent, height, bulk, or intensity of development; the location of development; the type, style, and intensity of adjacent land uses; the manner and method of construction, including materials, coatings, and landscaping; the interim and/or final use of the development; the type, location, and manner of illumination and signage; the nature and extent of terrain modification required; and the potential effects to the</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Land Use Policies 2.1, 4.1, 8.1, 8.3-8.4, 11.1, 13.1-13.8, 16.1, 17.1, 17.3, 17.6, 19.4, 21.2, 22.10, 22.11, 26.1, 26.3, 26.10, 26.11, and Open Space Policies 21.1, 21.2, 21.22, and 22.1-22.5. These policies provide guidance and some mitigation to reduce impacts to aesthetic and scenic resources, particularly with regard to terrain and location of new development. However, these measures do not provide development design standards which would ensure that aesthetic impacts relating to design would be less than significant. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.4.1A was proposed, which will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impacts to scenic vistas and visual resources, see DEIR, Section 4.4.3, pp. 4.4-5 to 4.4-9.</p>
--	-----------	--	--

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		established visual characteristic of the project site and/or an identified scenic vista/aesthetic resource.	
<p>4.4.2 <i>Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase the effects of light and glare upon existing residential uses, as well as the Mount Palomar Observatory. New light and glare would be created by the addition of residences and commercial establishments within the proposed General Plan. The most significant glare would be generated by commercial uses throughout the proposed General Plan area, especially in association with outdoor parking that may be lit at night and that would be visible from roadways. This is a potentially significant impact, but would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures.</i></p>	LS	<p>Ordinance: County of Riverside Ordinance No. 655, restricting the permitted use of certain light fixtures emitting into the night sky undesirable light rays which have a detrimental effect on astronomical observation and research.</p> <p>4.4.2A Riverside County shall require that sources of lighting within the General Plan area be limited to the minimum standard required to ensure safe circulation and visibility.</p> <p>4.4.2B Riverside County shall require exterior lighting for buildings to be of a low profile and intensity.</p> <p>4.4.2C The County shall establish a liaison with California Institute of Technology to ensure “dark skies” preservation procedures are incorporated, as necessary, in future County ordinances.</p> <p>4.4.2D The County shall participate in Palomar Observatory’s “dark sky” conservation area.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact can be minimized through the implementation of existing County Ordinance No. 655. The implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4.2A, 4.4.2B, 4.4.2C and 4.4.2D will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of this ordinance and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. For additional discussion regarding light and glare impacts caused by the project, see DEIR, section 4.4.3 , pp. 4.4-9 to 4.4-11.</p>
<p>4.4.3 <i>Implementation of the</i></p>	SU	No feasible mitigation measures exist to address	The conversion of open space to urban uses would result in a significant

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>proposed General Plan would result in conversion of open space areas to urban land use.</i></p>		<p>the conversion of open space to urban land.</p>	<p>unavoidable impact by causing the obstruction of existing open views as well as potentially obstructing distant panoramic views from existing development; therefore, implementation of the proposed General Plan will contribute significantly to the loss of visual character of the County. While the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures outlined in Impact 4.4.1 address the aesthetic impact of the new development, the Board finds that at this time, no additional mitigation is available to address the conversion of open space to urban land uses. This impact remains significant and unavoidable. The Board also finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project as modified by the adopted mitigation measures, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p> <p>For additional discussion of the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts to aesthetics/visual resources, see DEIR, Section 4.4.3, p. 4.4-11, Section 5.1.6, p. 5-4, and Section 5.4, p. 5-12.</p>
<p>4.5 Air Quality</p>			
<p>4.5.1 <i>Air quality impacts would occur during site preparation, including grading and equipment exhaust. Major sources of fugitive dust are a result of grading and site preparation during construction by vehicles and equipment and generated by construction vehicles and equipment</i></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Policies: AQ 4.9-4.10, AQ 17.1-17.5.</p> <p>4.5.1A Applicable Rule 403 Measures: Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers’ specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).</p> <p>C Water active sites at least twice daily. (Locations where grading is to occur will be thoroughly watered prior to</p>	<p>Implementation of the proposed General Plan Policies related to air quality would help reduce particulate matter air pollutant emissions and improve the air quality. In addition, implementation of the dust suppression rules and techniques of SCAQMD and MDAQMD, contained in Mitigation Measures 4.5.1A, 4.5.1B and 4.5.1C can reduce the fugitive dust generation (and thus the PM₁₀ component) by 50 percent or more. Compliance with these rules would reduce impacts on nearby sensitive receptors. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. These measures, however, cannot reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board further finds that there are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that the Board could adopt at</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>traveling over exposed surfaces, as well as by soil disturbances from grading and filling. Blowing dust is also of concern in the dry desert areas where PM₁₀ standards are exceeded by soil disturbance during grading, and vehicular travel over unpaved roads.</i></p>		<p>earthmoving).</p> <p>C All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered, or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).</p> <p>C Pave construction access roads at least 100 feet onto the site from main road.</p> <p>C Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.</p> <p>4.5.1B Additional SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Dust Measures:</p> <p>C Revegetate disturbed areas as quickly as possible.</p> <p>C All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.</p> <p>C All streets shall be swept once a day if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water).</p> <p>C Install wheel washers where vehicles enter</p>	<p>this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact, therefore, will remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less-than-significant) level, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the short-term construction impacts to air quality, see DEIR, Section 4.5.3, pp. 4.5-28 to 4.5-32, and Section 5.1.1, p. 5-1 to 5-2.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
-----------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

		<p>and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.</p> <p>4.5.1C Mitigation Measures for Construction Equipment and Vehicles Exhaust Emissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C The Construction Contractor shall select the construction equipment used on site based on low emission factors and high energy efficiency. C The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications. C The Construction Contractor shall utilize electric- or diesel-powered equipment, in lieu of gasoline-powered engines, where feasible. C The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period will be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize 	
--	--	---	--

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
----------------------	--	---	------------------

		<p>vehicles and equipment operating at the same time.</p> <p>C The Construction Contractor shall time the construction activities so as to not interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flagperson shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.</p> <p>C The Construction Contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew.</p> <p>C Dust generated by the development activities shall be retained on-site, and kept to a minimum by following the dust control measures listed below.</p> <p>a. During clearing, grading, earthmoving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease.</p> <p>b. During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the late morning, after work is</p>	
--	--	---	--

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>completed for the day, and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour.</p> <p>c. Immediately after clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.</p> <p>d. Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.</p> <p>e. Trucks transporting soil, sand, cut or fill materials, and/or construction debris to or from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin.</p>	
<p>4.5.2 <i>Long-term air emission impacts will occur from stationary sources related to the estimated development proposed through implementation of the proposed General Plan.</i></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Policies: AQ 4.1-4.8, AQ 5.1-5.3</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>Because of the characteristics of the proposed project, i.e., a General Plan, it is not possible to determine the location, size, and characteristics of future stationary pollution sources. It is, therefore, not feasible to quantify the proposed General Plan-related stationary sources emissions associated with the usage of electricity and natural gas. Similarly, the quantification of mitigation measures on emissions associated with these stationary sources is not feasible at a General Plan-level review document. Long-term stationary source emissions will occur as a result of build out of the proposed General Plan, and will be substantial. However, the proposed General Plan provides policies to reduce the effects on stationary source emissions.</p> <p>Implementation of Air Quality Policies 4.1 through 4.8 provided in the</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
			<p>proposed General Plan and adherence to existing air quality regulations will reduce the projected long-term increase in air pollutants resulting from stationary sources; however, they do not guarantee compliance with applicable air quality standards. The Board further finds that there are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that the Board could adopt at this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact, therefore, will remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less-than-significant) level, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the long term operations impacts to air quality, see DEIR, Section 4.5.3, pp. 4.5-32 to 4.5-34, and Section 5.1.1, p. 5-2.</p>
<p>4.5.3 <i>The proposed General Plan would result in changes in regional vehicular traffic trips and associated VMT.</i></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Policies: AQ 3.1-3.4, AQ 10.1-10.4, AQ 11.1-11.4, AQ 12.1-12.5, AQ 13.1-13.3, and AQ 14.1-14.4.</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>The proposed General Plan policies related to air quality would generally result in better planning and projects that proactively address any adverse air quality impacts that could result. Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies related to air quality would help reduce air pollutant emissions and improve the air quality. Policies are also provided to reduce vehicular trips. (See Air Quality Policies 3.1 through 3.4; 10.1 through 10.4; 11.1 through 11.4; 12.1 through 12.5; 13.1 through 13.3; and 14.1 through 14.4.)</p> <p>Implementation of the policies provided in the proposed General Plan will</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
			<p>reduce the projected long-term increase in air pollutants; however, significant impacts would remain. This impact is significant and unavoidable, and as the policies represent the best available mitigation measures, no further feasible mitigation measures are proposed.</p> <p>The Board further finds that there are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that the Board could adopt at this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less-than-significant) level, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impacts to air quality resulting from increased vehicular emissions, see DEIR, Section 4.5.3, pp. 4.5-34 to 4.5-38, and Section 5.1.1, p. 5-1 to 5.2</p>
<p>4.5.4 <i>Development under the proposed General Plan may produce air pollution that may significantly affect sensitive receptors.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: AQ 2.1-2.4.</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>Implementation of proposed General Plan Air Quality Policies 2.1 through 2.4 will reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors to increased air pollutants to a less-than-significant level. No additional mitigation measures have been identified. The Board finds that the policies incorporated into the project will mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impacts to air quality, see DEIR, Section 4.5.3, pp. 4.5-39.</p>
<p>4.6 Biological Resources</p>			
<p>4.6.1 <i>Implementation of the</i></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Policies: OS 5.1-5.3, OS 5.5-5.7, OS 6.1-6.2,</p>	<p>Proposed General Plan Open Space Policies 5.1 through 5.3, 5.5 through</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>proposed General Plan will result in the direct mortality of individuals of listed, proposed, or candidate species or loss of habitat occupied by such species.</i></p>		<p>OS 8.1, OS 9.3, OS 17.1-17.3, OS 18.1-18.2.</p> <p>4.6.1A Comply with Riverside County Planning Department <i>Biological Report Guidelines</i> to include an analysis of the potential for a proposed project to result in direct mortality of individuals of listed, proposed, or candidate species or loss of habitat occupied by such species and sensitive habitats.</p> <p>Under the Planning Department Guidelines, biological reports must be conducted as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reports must be prepared by a biologist on the County’s list of qualified consultants. b. The County Planning Department must be notified in advance that a report will be prepared for a specific project. c. The report must include a signed certification attesting to the report contents. d. The report must include specific information as to the type of survey (e.g., General Biological Resources Assessment, Habitat Assessment, etc.), site location, property owner, principal investigator, and contact information for participants in the field surveys. 	<p>5.7, 6.1, 6.2, 8.1, 9.3, 17.1 through 17.3, 18.1, and 18.2 address the effects of prospective development on biological resources. These policies will directly or indirectly address the direct mortality of individuals of listed, proposed, or candidate species or loss of habitat occupied by such species. The policies provide for avoidance and minimization of impacts to natural habitats, but do not specify a means for identifying habitats that warrant such measures. Nor do the policies specify parameters for compensating for the loss of habitats when avoidance or minimization of impacts is considered to be infeasible. The policies do not fully mitigate for the direct mortality of individuals of listed, proposed, or candidate species or loss of habitat occupied by such species. Therefore, in conjunction with the proposed General Plan policies, the Board also finds that Mitigation Measures 4.6.1A, 4.6.1B, and 4.6.1C will further reduce this impact and hereby directs that such measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact, although not to a less-than-significant level. In the absence of a comprehensive plan that addresses regional conservation issues (such as an approved MSHCP), implementation of the policies and mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis will result in the preservation of fragmented habitat patches and the isolation of associated biological resources. Habitat fragmentation will be most prevalent in upland habitats where areas are already fragmented to some degree and where a project-by-project analysis does not allow for the identification, or conservation, of regionally important linkages and natural processes. Proposed policies, regulatory requirements, and physical constraints on development will partially offset the fragmentation of riparian habitats. However, many species are dependent on riparian <i>and</i> upland habitats and will be lost unless both habitats are conserved together.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
----------------------	--	---	------------------

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. The report must include specified attachments (summary sheet, level of significance checklist, biological resources/project footprint map, and site photos). f. The report must include information on literature sources (e.g., California Natural Diversity Data Base, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and environmental documents for nearby projects). g. The report must include a description of surveys, including timing, personnel, and weather conditions. h. The report must include a description of site conditions including plant and wildlife habitat, disturbances, and sensitive elements. i. The report must include an assessment of anticipated project impacts and a discussion of mitigation. j. The report must include a list of all species observed or detected and a recommendation for any additional focused surveys that may be necessary. <p>The above list is a summary of the County’s guidelines, the actual guidelines available from</p>	<p>Additionally, in the absence of an approved MSHCP for both the Coachella Valley and western Riverside County, implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in cumulative significant unavoidable adverse effects on biological resources by causing a direct loss of sensitive natural communities, especially coastal sage scrub and meadow and marsh habitats; by causing fragmentation of sensitive habitats resulting in isolation of habitat patches creating a “checkerboard” pattern of small habitat patches of limited biological value; and by causing the fragmentation of habitat that constricts, inhibits, or eliminates wildlife movement.</p> <p>The Board finds that there are no additional mitigation measures or alternatives that the Board could adopt at this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Several commenters suggested more specific additional policies and mitigation measures they believe would further mitigate the impacts to biological resources posed by the proposed General Plan. (See, e.g., FEIR, pp. 2-35 to 2-39, 2-199, 2-280.) As explained by the County in its responses to these comments, requiring many of these mitigation measures would constrain development under the General Plan in a manner that is out of proportion to the broader scale and conceptual nature of the General Plan and would impose in many cases, a degree of inflexibility that would thwart the development of site-specific mitigation measures. (See FEIR, pp. 2-40 to 2-45, 2-281 to 2-282.) This impact, therefore, remains significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less-than-significant) level, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p>
--	--	---	--

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>the Planning Department shall be used in determining requirements for, and adequacy of, biological reports.</p> <p>4.6.1B Preserve habitat at minimum of 1:1 replacement ratio in locations that provide long-term conservation value for impacted resource. This could involve acquisition of habitat occupied by the affected species, acquiring a key parcel that fills in a missing link or gap in a reserve that provides conservation for the species, or acquisition of credits in a mitigation bank (endorsed by the USFWS and/or CDFG) that has been established to provide conservation value for the species. Implementation of the mitigation measure shall include provisions for the preservation of such areas in perpetuity.</p> <p>4.6.1C Comply with applicable HCPs.</p>	<p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts to biological resources, see DEIR, Section 4.6.3, pp. 4.6-28 to 4.6-31, Section 5.1.5, pp. 5-3 to 5-4, and Section 5.4, pp. 5-12 to 5-13.</p>
<p>4.6.2 <i>Alteration or loss of habitat of listed proposed, or candidate species that inhibits or compromises recovery efforts that could otherwise lead or contribute to the delisting of the species.</i></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Policies: OS 5.1-5.3, OS 5.5-5.7, OS 6.1, 6.2, OS 8.1, OS 9.3, OS 17.1-17.3, OS 18.1, 18.2.</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.6.1A, 4.6.1B, and 4.6.1C above.</p>	<p>The risk associated with this impact will be reduced by the implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies 5.1 through 5.3, 5.5 through 5.7, 6.1, 6.2, 8.1, 9.3, 17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 18.1 and 18.2. These proposed policies focus primarily on avoidance and minimization of impacts to floodplain, riparian, and wetland habitats; and maintaining and conserving superior examples of native vegetation. Avoidance and minimization of impacts to such areas may reduce impacts to associated listed, proposed, and candidate species. The proposed General Plan policies also focus on complying with applicable MSHCPs and on habitat</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
			<p>preservation through MSHCPs or through incentives for landowners.</p> <p>The policies do not describe a means for identifying species whose recovery may be inhibited as a result of proposed General Plan implementation. Nor do the policies describe how avoidance and minimization of impacts to riparian (and wetland) habitats will be assessed with regard to species recovery. Further, the policies do not specify parameters for compensating for the loss of habitat of a listed, proposed, or candidate species when avoidance or minimization of impacts is considered to be infeasible. The policies do not fully mitigate for the potential inhibition of recovery efforts for listed, proposed, or candidate species. Therefore, the Board finds that the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6.1A, 4.6.1B, and 4.6.1C are necessary and hereby directs that they be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact, although not to a less-than-significant level. In the absence of a comprehensive plan that addresses regional conservation issues (such as an approved MSHCP), implementation of the policies and mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis will result in the preservation of fragmented habitat patches and the isolation of associated biological resources. Habitat fragmentation will be most prevalent in upland habitats where areas are already fragmented to some degree and where a project-by-project analysis does not allow for the identification, or conservation, of regionally important linkages and natural processes. Proposed policies, regulatory requirements, and physical constraints on development will partially offset the fragmentation of riparian habitats. However, many species are dependent on riparian <i>and</i> upland habitats and will be lost unless both habitats are conserved together.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
			<p>Additionally, in the absence of an approved MSHCP for both the Coachella Valley and western Riverside County, implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in cumulative significant unavoidable adverse effects on biological resources by causing a direct loss of sensitive natural communities, especially coastal sage scrub and meadow and marsh habitats; by causing fragmentation of sensitive habitats resulting in isolation of habitat patches creating a “checkerboard” pattern of small habitat patches of limited biological value; and by causing the fragmentation of habitat that constricts, inhibits, or eliminates wildlife movement.</p> <p>The Board therefore finds that there are no additional mitigation measures or alternatives that the Board could adopt at this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Several commenters suggested more specific additional policies and mitigation measures they believe would further mitigate the impacts to biological resources posed by the proposed General Plan. (See, e.g., FEIR, pp. 2-35 to 2-39, 2-199, 2-280.) As explained by the County in its responses to these comments, requiring many of these mitigation measures would constrain development under the General Plan in a manner that is out of proportion to the broader scale and conceptual nature of the General Plan and would impose in many cases, a degree of inflexibility that would thwart the development of site-specific mitigation measures. (See FEIR, pp. 2-40 to 2-45, 2-281 to 2-282.) This impact, therefore, remains significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less-than-significant) level, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
			<p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts to habitat of listed, proposed, or candidate species, see DEIR, Section 4.6.3, pp. 4.6-32 to 4.6-35, Section 5.1.5, pp. 5-3 to 5-4, and Section 5.4, pp. 5-12 to -13.</p>
<p>4.6.3 <i>Implementation of the proposed General Plan would cause direct loss of sensitive habitat.</i></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Policies: OS 5.1-5.3, OS 5.5-5.7, OS 6.1, 6.2, OS 8.1, OS 9.3, 9.4, OS 17.1-17.3, OS 18.1, 18.2.</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measures 4.6.1A and 4.6.1B, above, along with the following mitigation measure.</p> <p>4.6.3A Construct treatment wetlands outside of natural wetlands, allowing treatment of runoff from developed surfaces prior to entering natural stream systems.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies 5.1 through 5.3, 5.5 through 5.7, 6.1, 6.2, 8.1, 9.3, 9.4, 17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 18.1, and 18.2. In addition, the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6.1A, 4.6.1B and 4.6.3A will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact, although not to a less-than-significant level. In the absence of a comprehensive plan that addresses regional conservation issues (such as an approved MSHCP), implementation of the policies and mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis will result in the preservation of fragmented habitat patches and the isolation of associated biological resources. Habitat fragmentation will be most prevalent in upland habitats where areas are already fragmented to some degree and where a project-by-project analysis does not allow for the identification, or conservation, of regionally important linkages and natural processes. Proposed policies, regulatory requirements, and physical constraints on development will partially offset the fragmentation of riparian habitats. However, many species are dependent on riparian <i>and</i> upland habitats and will be lost unless both habitats are conserved together.</p> <p>Additionally, in the absence of an approved MSHCP for both the Coachella Valley and western Riverside County, implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in cumulative significant unavoidable</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
			<p>adverse effects on biological resources by causing a direct loss of sensitive natural communities, especially coastal sage scrub and meadow and marsh habitats; by causing fragmentation of sensitive habitats resulting in isolation of habitat patches creating a “checkerboard” pattern of small habitat patches of limited biological value; and by causing the fragmentation of habitat that constricts, inhibits, or eliminates wildlife movement.</p> <p>The Board therefore finds that there are no additional mitigation measures or alternatives that the Board could adopt at this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Several commenters suggested more specific additional policies and mitigation measures they believe would further mitigate the impacts to biological resources posed by the proposed General Plan. (See, e.g., FEIR, pp. 2-35 to 2-39, 2-199, 2-280.) As explained by the County in its responses to these comments, requiring many of these mitigation measures would constrain development under the General Plan in a manner that is out of proportion to the broader scale and conceptual nature of the General Plan and would impose in many cases, a degree of inflexibility that would thwart the development of site-specific mitigation measures. (See FEIR, pp. 2-40 to 2-45, 2-281 to 2-282.) This impact, therefore, remains significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less-than-significant) level, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p> <p>For additional discussion of the project’s impacts to sensitive habitat, see DEIR, Section 4.6.3, pp. 4.6-35 to 4.6-38, Section 5.1.5, pp. 5-3 to 5-4,</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
----------------------	--	---	------------------

			and Section 5.4, pp. 5-12 to 5-13.
<p>4.6.4 <i>Implementation of the proposed General Plan would cause habitat fragmentation resulting in isolation of sensitive habitat patches, creating a “checkerboard” pattern of small habitat patches of limited biological value.</i></p>	<p align="center">SU</p>	<p>Policies: OS 5.1-5.7, OS 6.1, OS 6.2, OS 8.1, OS 9.3, OS 9.4, OS 17.1-17.3, OS 18.1, OS 18.2.</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.6.1A and 4.6.1C, above, along with the following mitigation measures.</p> <p>4.6.4B Identify local and regional habitat patterns whereby sensitive habitats are connected or where opportunities exist to reconnect isolated patches of sensitive habitat. The baseline data of the Western Riverside County MSHCP provides a biologically sound depiction of habitat linkages that would provide regional connections between existing biological reserves and other conservation lands. Avoid impacts that would fragment sensitive habitat, or acquire land that would reconnect isolated habitat patches and create or restore habitat to reestablish the connection. Where on-site habitat preservation would not provide meaningful mitigation either for an affected sensitive species or for habitat connectivity, off-site mitigation shall be implemented through the acquisition of lands that provide for regional habitat connectivity. Implementation of the mitigation measure shall</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies 5.1 through 5.7, 6.1, 6.2, 8.1, 9.3, 9.4, 17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 18.1, and 18.2. These policies focus primarily on avoidance and minimization of impacts to floodplain, riparian, and wetland habitats; maintaining and conserving superior examples of vegetation; and complying with applicable MSHCPs. The policies provide for avoidance and minimization of impacts associated with fragmentation but do not specify a means for identifying specific sites (either locally or regionally) that warrant such measures. Nor do the policies specify parameters for compensating for habitat fragmentation when avoidance or minimization of impacts is considered to be infeasible. The policies do not fully mitigate for the effects of habitat fragmentation. The implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6.1A, 4.6.1C, and 4.6.4B will further reduce this impact. Therefore, the Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact, although not to a less-than-significant level. In the absence of a comprehensive plan that addresses regional conservation issues (such as an approved MSHCP), implementation of the policies and mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis will result in the preservation of fragmented habitat patches and the isolation of associated biological resources. Habitat fragmentation will be most prevalent in upland habitats where areas are already fragmented to some degree and where a project-by-project analysis does not allow for the identification, or conservation, of regionally important linkages and natural processes. Proposed policies, regulatory requirements, and physical constraints on development will partially offset the fragmentation of riparian habitats. However, many</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>include provisions for the preservation of such areas in perpetuity.</p>	<p>species are dependent on riparian <i>and</i> upland habitats and will be lost unless both habitats are conserved together.</p> <p>Additionally, in the absence of an approved MSHCP for both the Coachella Valley and western Riverside County, implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in cumulative significant unavoidable adverse effects on biological resources by causing a direct loss of sensitive natural communities, especially coastal sage scrub and meadow and marsh habitats; by causing fragmentation of sensitive habitats resulting in isolation of habitat patches creating a “checkerboard” pattern of small habitat patches of limited biological value; and by causing the fragmentation of habitat that constricts, inhibits, or eliminates wildlife movement.</p> <p>The Board therefore finds that there are no additional mitigation measures or alternatives that the Board could adopt at this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Several commenters suggested more specific additional policies and mitigation measures they believe would further mitigate the impacts to biological resources posed by the proposed General Plan. (See, e.g., FEIR, pp. 2-35 to 2-39, 2-199, 2-280.) As explained by the County in its responses to these comments, requiring many of these mitigation measures would constrain development under the General Plan in a manner that is out of proportion to the broader scale and conceptual nature of the General Plan and would impose in many cases, a degree of inflexibility that would thwart the development of site-specific mitigation measures. (See FEIR, pp. 2-40 to 2-45, 2-281 to 2-282.) This impact, therefore, remains significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less-than-significant) level, the Board finds that specific</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
			<p>economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p> <p>For additional discussion of the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts to biological resources, see DEIR, Section 4.6.3, pp. 4.6-38 to 4.6-42, Section 5.1.5, pp. 5-3 to 5-4, and Section 5.4, pp. 5-12 to 5-13.</p>
<p>4.6.5 <i>The proposed General Plan would cause fragmentation of habitat that constricts, inhibits, or eliminates wildlife movement.</i></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Policies: OS 5.1-5.7, OS 6.1, OS 6.2, OS 8.1, OS 9.3, OS 9.4, OS 17.1-17.3, OS 18.1, OS 18.2.</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.6.1A, 4.6.1C and 4.6.4B, above.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies 5.1 through 5.7, 6.1, 6.2, 8.1, 9.3, 9.4, 17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 18.1, and 18.2. These policies focus primarily on avoidance and minimization of impacts to floodplain, riparian, and wetland habitats; maintaining and conserving superior examples of vegetation; and complying with applicable MSHCPs. The policies provide for avoidance and minimization of impacts associated with fragmentation but do not specify a means for identifying specific sites (either locally or regionally) that warrant such measures. Nor do the policies specify parameters for compensating for habitat fragmentation when avoidance or minimization of impacts is considered to be infeasible. The policies do not fully mitigate for the effects of habitat fragmentation. The implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6.1A, 4.6.1C and 4.6.4B will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact, although not to a less-than-significant level. In the absence of a comprehensive plan that addresses regional conservation issues (such as an approved MSHCP), implementation of the policies and mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis will result in the preservation of fragmented habitat patches and the isolation of associated biological</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
-----------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

			<p>resources. Habitat fragmentation will be most prevalent in upland habitats where areas are already fragmented to some degree and where a project-by-project analysis does not allow for the identification, or conservation, of regionally important linkages and natural processes. Proposed policies, regulatory requirements, and physical constraints on development will partially offset the fragmentation of riparian habitats. However, many species are dependent on riparian <i>and</i> upland habitats and will be lost unless both habitats are conserved together.</p> <p>Additionally, in the absence of an approved MSHCP for both the Coachella Valley and western Riverside County, implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in cumulative significant unavoidable adverse effects on biological resources by causing a direct loss of sensitive natural communities, especially coastal sage scrub and meadow and marsh habitats; by causing fragmentation of sensitive habitats resulting in isolation of habitat patches creating a “checkerboard” pattern of small habitat patches of limited biological value; and by causing the fragmentation of habitat that constricts, inhibits, or eliminates wildlife</p> <p>The Board therefore finds that there are no additional mitigation measures or alternatives that the Board could adopt at this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Several commenters suggested more specific additional policies and mitigation measures they believe would further mitigate the impacts to biological resources posed by the proposed General Plan. (See, e.g., FEIR, pp. 2-35 to 2-39, 2-199, 2-280.) As explained by the County in its responses to these comments, requiring many of these mitigation measures would constrain development under the General Plan in a manner that is out of proportion to the broader scale and conceptual nature of the General Plan and would impose in many cases, a degree of inflexibility that would thwart the development of site-specific</p>
--	--	--	---

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
			<p>mitigation measures. (See FEIR, pp. 2-40 to 2-45, 2-281 to 2-282.) This impact, therefore, remains significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less-than-significant) level, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p> <p>For additional discussion of the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts to biological resources, see DEIR, Section 4.6.3, pp. 4.6-42 to 4.6-46, Section 5.1.5, pp. 5-3 to 5-4, and Section 5.4, pp. 5-12 to 5-13.</p>
<p>4.6.6 <i>Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in direct loss of oak trees or alteration of natural processes (e.g., hydrology) resulting in indirect loss of oak trees.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: OS 5.1-5.7, OS 6.1, OS 6.2, OS 8.1, OS 9.3, OS 9.4, OS 17.1-17.3, OS 18.1, OS 18.2.</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.6.1A above along with the following mitigation measure.</p> <p>4.6.6B Comply with Oak Tree Management Guidelines, including the use of replacement plantings with acorns or oak saplings when it is determined to be biologically sound and appropriate to do so.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies 5.1 through 5.7, 6.1, 6.2, 8.1, 9.3, 9.4, 17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 18.1, and 18.2. These policies focus primarily on avoidance and minimization of impacts to floodplain, riparian, and wetland habitats; maintaining and conserving superior examples of native vegetation; and complying with applicable MSHCPs. Oak trees are often found in floodplain and riparian habitat areas but are also found in other locations. The policies provide for identifying specific sites that warrant such measures. The policies do not specify a means for determining if natural processes will be altered to such a degree as to result in the indirect loss of oak trees. Nor do the policies specify parameters for compensating for loss of oak trees when avoidance or minimization of impacts is considered to be infeasible. The policies do not fully mitigate for the impacts to oak trees. The implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6.1A and 4.6.6B will further reduce this impact as these measures will provide for sufficient assessment of oak trees and associated natural processes and allow for the incorporation of mitigating</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
			<p>measures as needed during future project review. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effect on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact on oak trees, see DEIR, Section 4.6.3, pp. 4.6-46 to 4.6-50.</p>
<p>4.6.7 <i>Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in alteration of habitat or natural processes that would result in the direct or indirect mortality of listed, proposed, or candidate species or that would result in loss, fragmentation, or isolation of sensitive habitat(s).</i></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Policies: OS 5.1-5.3, OS 5.5-5.7, OS 6.1, OS 6.2, OS 8.1, OS 9.3, OS 9.4, OS 17.1-17.3, OS 18.1, OS 18.2.</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measures 4.6.1A, 4.6.1C and 4.6.6B, above, along with the following mitigation measures.</p> <p>4.6.7B Avoid or minimize interruption of natural processes in local ecosystems.</p> <p>4.6.7C Identify local and regional habitat patterns whereby sensitive habitats are connected or where opportunities exist to reconnect isolated patches of sensitive habitat. Avoid impacts that would fragment sensitive habitat, or acquire land that would reconnect isolated habitat patches and create or restore habitat to reestablish the connection.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.1, 6.2, 8.1, 9.3, 9.4, 17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 18.1, and 18.2. These policies focus primarily on avoidance and minimization of impacts to floodplain, riparian, and wetland habitats; maintaining and conserving superior examples of native vegetation; and complying with applicable MSHCPs. To the extent that natural processes are associated with such measures, the policies will provide for avoidance and minimization of some impacts (i.e., hydrology associated with floodplains, riparian, and wetland habitats). These policies, however, do not specify a means for determining if natural processes will be altered to such a degree as to result in the indirect loss of sensitive species and/or habitats. The implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6.1A, 4.6.1C, 4.6.7B, 4.6.7C, 4.6.7D, and 4.6.7E will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact, although not to a less-than-significant level. In the absence of a comprehensive plan that addresses regional conservation issues (such as</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>Implementation of the mitigation measure shall include provisions for the preservation of such areas in perpetuity.</p> <p>4.6.7D Construct facilities to treat non-point source runoff outside natural stream systems thereby allowing only treated runoff to enter natural stream systems. Treatment facilities may be mechanical (i.e., filtration devices within storm drain systems), biological (i.e., constructed wetlands at storm drain outfalls), or a combination of the two means.</p> <p>4.6.7E The following measures will be implemented to mitigate the potential spread of invasive plant species from construction areas:</p> <p>C Soil exposed during construction and maintenance activities shall be landscaped utilizing seeds, cuttings, and/or plant material from locally adapted species to preclude the invasion of noxious weeds. The use of site-specific materials, which are adapted to local conditions, increases the likelihood that revegetation will be successful and maintains the genetic integrity of the local ecosystem. Arrangements will be made well in advance of planting (nine months, if possible) to ensure that plant materials are located and</p>	<p>an approved MSHCP), implementation of the policies and mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis will result in the preservation of fragmented habitat patches and the isolation of associated biological resources. Habitat fragmentation will be most prevalent in upland habitats where areas are already fragmented to some degree and where a project-by-project analysis does not allow for the identification, or conservation, of regionally important linkages and natural processes. Proposed policies, regulatory requirements, and physical constraints on development will partially offset the fragmentation of riparian habitats. However, many species are dependent on riparian <i>and</i> upland habitats and will be lost unless both habitats are conserved together.</p> <p>Additionally, in the absence of an approved MSHCP for both the Coachella Valley and western Riverside County, implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in cumulative significant unavoidable adverse effects on biological resources by causing a direct loss of sensitive natural communities, especially coastal sage scrub and meadow and marsh habitats; by causing fragmentation of sensitive habitats resulting in isolation of habitat patches creating a “checkerboard” pattern of small habitat patches of limited biological value; and by causing the fragmentation of habitat that constricts, inhibits, or eliminates wildlife movement.</p> <p>The Board therefore finds that there are no additional mitigation measures or alternatives that the Board could adopt at this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Several commenters suggested more specific additional policies and mitigation measures they believe would further mitigate the impacts to biological resources posed by the proposed General Plan. (See, e.g., FEIR, pp. 2-35 to2-39, 2-199, 2-280.) As explained by the County in its responses to these comments, requiring</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>available for the scheduled planting time. Sufficient time should be allocated for a qualified specialist to visit the project site during the appropriate season and collect the native plant material. If local propagules are not available or cannot be collected in sufficient quantities, materials collected or grown from other sources within Southern California shall be substituted. For widespread native herbaceous species that are more likely to be genetically homogeneous, site specificity is a less important consideration, and seed from commercial sources may be used.</p> <p>C Seed purity shall be certified by planting seeds labeled under the California Food and Agricultural Code, or that have been tested within a year by a seed laboratory certified by the Association of Official Seed Analysts or by a seed technologist certified by the Society of Commercial Seed Technologists.</p> <p>C Construction equipment will be cleaned of mud or other debris that may contain invasive plants and/or seeds and inspected to reduce the potential of spreading noxious weeds (before mobilizing to arrive at the site and before leaving the site).</p>	<p>many of these mitigation measures would constrain development under the General Plan in a manner that is out of proportion to the broader scale and conceptual nature of the General Plan and would impose in many cases, a degree of inflexibility that would thwart the development of site-specific mitigation measures. (See FEIR, pp. 2-40 to 2-45, 2-281 to 2-282.) This impact, therefore, remains significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less-than-significant) level, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p> <p>For additional discussion of the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts to biological resources, see DEIR, Section 4.6.3, pp. 4.6-50 to 4.6-54, Section 5.1.5, pp. 5-3 to 5-4, and Section 5.4, pp. 5-12 to 5-13.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
----------------------	--	---	------------------

		<p>C Vehicles with loads carrying vegetation shall be covered and vegetative materials removed from the site shall be disposed of in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.</p>	
--	--	--	--

4.7 Cultural Resources

<p>4.7.1 <i>Build out within now vacant unincorporated areas of the County will result in a substantial increase in population and residential and non-residential structures, and associated infrastructure. Development associated with the proposed General Plan would require disturbance of vacant lands. Development allowed by implementation of the proposed General Plan could have the potential to disturb buried human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, and buried cultural resources.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: OS 19.2-19.4, OS 19.8, OS 19.10</p> <p>4.7.1A If human remains are encountered during a public or private construction activity, State Health and Safety Code 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The Riverside County Coroner must be notified within 24 hours.</p> <p>a. If the coroner determines that the burial is not historic, but prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted to determine the most likely descendent (MLD) for this area. The MLD may become involved with the disposition of the burial following scientific analysis.</p> <p>4.7.1B Avoidance is the preferred treatment for cultural resources. Where possible, project</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies OS 19.2-19.4, OS 19.8 and OS 19.10. Implementation of these policies relating to cultural resources would help reduce the effects of growth and development. However, because these policies do not provide performance standards to protect buried cultural resources, Mitigation Measures 4.7.1A, 4.7.1B, and 4.7.1C were proposed to ensure that if buried resources are found, they will be protected. Therefore, the Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The Board finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to cultural resources, see DEIR, Section 4.7.3, pp. 4.7-22 to 4.7-25.</p>
--	-----------	--	--

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
-----------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

		<p>plans shall be developed to allow avoidance of cultural resources. Where avoidance of construction impacts is possible, capping of the cultural resource site and avoidance planting (e.g., planting of prickly pear cactus) shall be employed to ensure that indirect impacts from increased public availability to the site are avoided. Where avoidance is selected, cultural resource sites shall be placed within permanent conservation easements or dedicated open space.</p> <p>4.7.1C If avoidance and/or preservation in place of cultural resources is not possible, the following mitigation measures shall be initiated for each impacted site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A participant-observer from the appropriate Indian Band or Tribe shall be used during archaeological testing or excavation in the project site. b. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the project, the project proponent shall develop a test level research design detailing how the cultural resource investigation shall be executed and providing specific research questions that shall be addressed through the excavation program. In particular, the testing program 	
--	--	--	--

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>shall characterize the site constituents, horizontal and vertical extent, and, if possible, period of use. The testing program shall also address the California Register and National Register eligibility of the cultural resource and make recommendations as to the suitability of the resource for listing on either Register. The research design shall be submitted to the County of Riverside Regional Park and Open-Space District for review and comment. For sites determined, through the Testing Program, to be ineligible for listing on either the California or National Register, execution of the Testing Program will suffice as mitigation of project impacts to this resource.</p> <p>c. After approval of the research design and prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall complete the excavation program as specified in the research design. The results of this excavation program shall be presented in a technical report that follows the County of Riverside outline for Archaeological Testing. The Test Level Report shall be submitted to the County of Riverside Regional Park and Open-Space District for review and comment. If cultural resources</p>	

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
-----------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

		<p>that would be affected by the project are found ineligible for listing on the California or National Register, test level investigations will have depleted the scientific value of the sites and the project can proceed.</p> <p>d. If the resource is identified as being potentially eligible for either the California or National Register, and project designs cannot be altered to avoid impacting the site, a Treatment Program to mitigate project effects shall be initiated. A Treatment Plan detailing the objectives of the Treatment Program shall be developed. The Treatment Plan shall contain specific, testable hypotheses relative to the sites under study and shall attempt to address the potential of the sites to address these research questions. The Treatment Plan shall be submitted to the County of Riverside Regional Park and Open-Space District for review and comment.</p> <p>e. After approval of the Treatment Plan, the Treatment Program for affected, eligible sites shall be initiated. Typically a Treatment Program involves excavation of a statistically representative sample of the site to preserve those resource values that</p>	
--	--	---	--

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>qualify the site as being eligible for the California or National Register. At the conclusion of the excavation or research program, a Treatment Report, following the outline of the County of Riverside for Archaeological Mitigation or Data Recovery, shall be developed. This data recovery report shall be submitted to the County of Riverside Regional Park and Open-Space District for review and comment.</p>	
<p>4.7.2 <i>Build out within now vacant unincorporated areas of the County will result in a substantial increase in population and residential and non-residential structures, and associated infrastructure. Development associated with the proposed General Plan would require disturbance of vacant lands and possible conversion of existing structures into various land uses (e.g., historic homes into office space). Development allowed by implementation of the proposed General Plan could</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: OS 19.5-19.7. Implement Mitigation Measures 4.7.1B and 4.7.1C, above.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies OS 19.5-19.7. Implementation of these policies relating to historic resources would help reduce the effects of growth and development by requiring development proposals to be evaluated for the presence of historic resources; by protecting historic buildings from demolition; and providing capital for preservation of historic buildings. Mitigation Measures 4.7.1B, and 4.7.1C will provide an additional level of protection against significant adverse impacts to historic resources. Therefore, the Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The Board finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to historic resources, see DEIR, Section 4.7.3, pp. 4.7-25 to 4.7-26.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>cause the destruction of or loss of an historical resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5.</i></p>			
<p>4.7.3 <i>Build out within now vacant unincorporated areas of the County will result in a substantial increase in population and residential and non-residential structures, and associated infrastructure. Development associated with the proposed General Plan would require disturbance of vacant lands. Development allowed by implementation of the proposed General Plan could cause the destruction of known archaeological resources, as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5.</i></p>	<p align="center">LS</p>	<p>Policies: OS 19.2-19.4, 19.8, 19.10.</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.7.1B and 4.7.1C, above.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies OS 19.2-19.4, OS 19.8 and OS 19.10. However, these policies do not protect archaeological resources from being destroyed by future development. Although Riverside County and the proposed General Plan have policies to protect and minimize adverse impacts on archaeological resources, the potential exists for destruction of known archaeological resources to occur if mitigation is not provided to protect such resources. Therefore, to ensure that future development in the County would not have any significant adverse impacts on such resources, 4.7.1B, and 4.7.1C were proposed. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of effects on archaeological resources to less than significant. Therefore, the Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The Board finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to cultural resources, see DEIR, Section 4.7.3, pp. 4.7-26 to 4.7-27.</p>
<p>4.7.4 <i>Build out within now vacant unincorporated areas of the County will result in a substantial increase in</i></p>	<p align="center">LS</p>	<p>Policies: OS 19.9.</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>The Board finds that Open Space Policy 19.9 relating to paleontological resources in the proposed General Plan will mitigate or avoid this significant effect on the environment. The Board therefore finds that no additional mitigation is necessary.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>population and residential and non-residential structures, and associated infrastructure. Development associated with the proposed General Plan would require disturbance of vacant lands. Therefore, development as a result of implementation of the proposed General Plan could potentially destroy directly or indirectly a unique paleontological resource or site.</i></p>			<p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to cultural resources, see DEIR, Section 4.7.3, pp. 4.7-27 to 4.7-28.</p>
4.8 Energy			
<p>4.8.1 <i>Build out within unincorporated areas of the County will result in a substantial increase in population and residential and non-residential structures, potentially increasing the use of and need for natural gas. Due to the growth involved in the proposed General Plan, this increase may potentially impact existing natural gas facilities.</i></p>	<p align="center">LS</p>	<p>Policies: OS 10.1-10.2, OS 11.1-11.3, OS 12.1-12.4, OS 16.1-16.5, OS 16.7-16.10.</p> <p>4.8.1A The County shall review all development proposals prior to the approval of development plans to guarantee that sufficient energy resources and facilities are available to supply adequate energy to the proposed project and associated uses.</p> <p>4.8.1B The County shall review all development plans prior to approval to guarantee that energy conservation and efficiency standards of Title 24 are met and are</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies OS 10.1-10.2, 11.1-11.3, 12.1-12.4, 16.1-16.5, and 16.7-16.10. However, these policies do not provide concrete means of implementation and enforcement. Many policies lack performance standards that ensure appropriate actions and parameters would be achieved. Therefore, to ensure that impacts to energy resources due to the additional demand for and consumption of energy resources (natural gas) associated with the prospective growth within the County can be further minimized, Mitigation Measures 4.8.1A and 4.8.1B were proposed. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of effects on energy resources to less than significant. Therefore, the Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>incorporated into the design of the future proposed project.</p>	<p>The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impacts to energy, see DEIR, Section 4.8.3, pp. 4.8-3 to 4.8-5.</p>
<p>4.8.2 <i>Build out within unincorporated areas of the County will result in a substantial increase in population and residential and non-residential structures, potentially increasing the use of and need for electricity. Due to the growth involved in the proposed General Plan, this increase may potentially result in an impact on existing electrical generating facilities</i></p>	<p align="center">LS</p>	<p>Policies: OS 10.1-10.2, OS 16.1-16.5, OS 16.7-16.10.</p> <p>Impacts to energy resources due to the additional demand and consumption of energy resources (electricity) associated with the prospective growth within the County can be further minimized through implementation of mitigation measures 4.8.1A and 4.8.1B.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies OS 10.1-10.2, 16.1-16.5, and 16.7-16.10. However, these policies do not provide concrete means of implementation and enforcement. Many policies lack performance standards that ensure appropriate actions and parameters would be achieved. Therefore, to ensure that impacts to energy resources due to the additional demand for and consumption of energy resources (electricity) associated with the prospective growth within the County can be further minimized, Mitigation Measures 4.8.1A and 4.8.1B were proposed. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of effects on energy resources to less than significant. Therefore, the Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>Although the impacts to energy will be reduced to a less than significant level, electricity costs to consumers will likely increase compared to past levels until additional generating capacity can be brought on-line and the cost and supply adjustment is stabilized. For additional discussion regarding the project’s impacts to energy, see DEIR, Section 4.8.3, pp. 4.8-</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
----------------------	--	---	------------------

			5 to 4.8-7
--	--	--	------------

4.9 Flood and Dam Inundation Hazards

<p>4.9.1 <i>Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the development of a significant amount of vacant lands within the County. The addition of impervious surfaces would substantially increase the potential stormwater runoff from areas throughout the County. Existing drainage facilities may not be adequate to accommodate the future potential increase in stormwater runoff. Therefore, the implementation of development in accordance with the proposed General Plan may result in significant impacts related to existing drainage facilities.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: S 4.4-4.6, S 4.11, S 4.19.</p> <p>Existing Policies and Regulations: National Flood Insurance Program Reform Act of 1994, Federal Executive Order 11988, the Cobey-Alquist Flood Plain Management Act 8401</p> <p>4.9.1A LOMA and LOMR/LOMR-F are documents issued by FEMA that officially remove a property and/or structure from a special flood hazard area of a Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). These letters shall be accepted by Riverside County where applicable.</p> <p>4.9.1B Riverside County shall prohibit alteration of floodways and channelization unless alternative methods of flood control feasible or unless alternative methods are utilized to the maximum extent practicable.</p> <p>4.9.1C Riverside County shall not necessarily require all land uses to withstand flooding. Some development may be compatible within flood plains and flood ways, as may some other land uses. For these land uses, flows shall not be obstructed, and upstream and downstream</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Safety Policies 4.4-4.6, 4.11, and 4.19, relating to flooding hazards. These policies will reduce the effects of future growth and development in Riverside County on drainage facilities. These policies, however, do not provide for a Letter of Map Amendment (“LOMA”) or Letter of Map Revision (LOMR/LOMR-F), floodway alterations requirements, or the discussion of certain land uses that may not require flood control. Nor do the policies discuss details concerning containment of 10-year flood flows and 100-year flood flows. The implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.9.1A, 4.9.1B, 4.9.1C, and 4.9.1D, will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. In addition, adherence to the National Flood Insurance Program Reform Act of 1994, Federal Executive Order 11988, the Cobey-Alquist Flood Plain Management Act 8401, and Water Code Section 8100 will minimize the effects of flood hazards. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impacts on existing drainage facilities, see DEIR, Section 4.9.3, pp. 4.9-10 to 4.9-12.</p>
---	-----------	---	---

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>properties shall not be adversely affected by increased velocities, erosion backwater effects, or concentration of flows, and adverse impacts to water quality from point and nonpoint sources of pollution.</p> <p>4.9.1.D Riverside County shall <u>generally</u> require the 10-year flood flows to be contained within the top of curbs and the 100-year flood flows within the street rights-of-way.</p>	
<p>4.9.2 <i>Implementation of the proposed General Plan would contribute to an increase in development in vacant areas of Riverside County. Development has the potential to increase the risk of flooding, which leads to damage to structures and risk to the health and safety of people. This is a potentially significant impact of the implementation of the proposed General Plan.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: S 4.1-4.3, S 4.6, S 4.9, S 4.10, S 4.20-4.23.</p> <p>Existing Policies and Regulations: National Flood Insurance Program Reform Act of 1994, Federal Executive Order 11988, the Cobey-Alquist Flood Plain Management Act 8401</p> <p>4.9.2A Riverside County shall require that all structures (residential, commercial, and industrial) be flood-proofed from the 100-year storm flows. In some cases, this may involve elevating the finished floor more than 1 foot.</p> <p>4.9.2B Riverside County shall require that fully enclosed areas that are below finished floors have openings to equalize the forces on both sides of the walls.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Safety Policies 4.1-4.3, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10 and 4.20-4.23, relating to limiting growth in flood-prone areas. With implementation of these policies, the risks associated with the placement of habitable structures (any structure that can hold people for any length of time) and housing within a 100-year flood hazard would not be significantly adverse. However, circumstances where elevation of more than 1 foot may be necessary or the requirement for openings of fully enclosed areas that are situated below finished floors were not addressed. In addition, some land uses that are located within a flood hazard area requiring different flood-proofing was not discussed. Floodway fringe development was also not dealt with. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 4.9.2A, 4.9.2B, 4.9.2C, and 4.9.2D were proposed, which will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. In addition, adherence to the National Flood Insurance Program Reform Act of 1994, Federal Executive</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>4.9.2C Riverside County shall require that for agricultural, recreation, or other low-density uses, flows are not obstructed and that upstream and downstream properties are not adversely affected by increased velocities, erosion backwater effects, or concentration of flows.</p> <p>4.9.2D Provided the applicant does hydrological studies, engineers structures to be safe from flooding, and provides evidence that the structures will not adversely impact the flood plain, Riverside County may allow development into the floodway fringe.</p>	<p>Order 11988, the Cobey-Alquist Flood Plain Management Act 8401, and Water Code Section 8100 will minimize the effects of flood hazards. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s flooding impacts, see DEIR, Section 4.9.3, pp. 4.9-12 to 4.9-14.</p>
<p>4.9.3 <i>The implementation of the proposed General Plan may place habitable structures within dam inundation areas. This is a potentially significant impact of the implementation of the proposed General Plan.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: S 4.17-4.18.</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>The Board finds that implementation of General Plan Safety Policies 4.17-4.18 will reduce the effects of growth and development to ensure that future development in Riverside County would not have any significant adverse impacts from dam inundation hazards. In addition, adherence to the National Flood Insurance Program Reform Act of 1994, Federal Executive Order 11988, the Cobey-Alquist Flood Plain Management Act 8401, Water Code Section 8100, and existing County of Riverside requirements, will minimize the effects of flood hazards to a less than significant level. The Board therefore finds that no additional mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to structures within dam inundation areas, see DEIR, Section 4.9.3, pp. 4.9-14 to 4.9-16.</p>
<p>4.10 Geology and Slope Stability</p>			

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p>4.10.1 <i>Future development permitted by the proposed General Plan may increase the potential for property loss, injury, or death resulting from development on or adjacent to known and/or as of yet undetected earthquake fault zones. Impacts associated with this issue are potentially significant.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: S 2.1, S 3.3, S 7.7d.</p> <p>4.10.1A Before a project is approved or otherwise permitted within a State Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Faulting Zone (A-P Zone), County Fault Zone, within 150 feet of any other active or potentially active fault mapped in a published United States Geologic Survey (USGS) or CGS reports, or within other potential earthquake hazard area (as determined by the County Geologist), a site-specific geologic investigation shall be prepared to assess potential seismic hazards resulting from development of the project site. Where and when required, the geotechnical investigation shall address the issue(s), hazard(s), and geographic area(s) determined by the County Geologist to be relevant to each development. The site-specific geotechnical investigation shall incorporate up-to-date data from government and non-government sources.</p> <p>Based on the site-specific geotechnical investigation, no structures intended for human occupancy shall be constructed across active faults. This site-specific evaluation and written report shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits. If an active fault is</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Safety Policies 2.1, 3.3, and 7.7d relating to earthquakes and fault zones. However, these policies do not address potential impacts related to undiscovered faults or impacts that may be identified through the use of new scientific data, equipment, or procedures. To provide adequate mitigation for potential fault rupture hazards, Mitigation Measure 4.10.1A was proposed to provide flexibility to the County in requiring site-specific geotechnical investigations in any area falling within identified or as yet unidentified fault zones. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding impacts associated with this issue, see DEIR, Section 4.10.3, pp. 4.10-27 to 4.10-29.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>discovered, any structure intended for human occupancy shall be set back at least 50 feet from the fault. A larger or smaller setback may be established if such a setback is supported by adequate evidence as presented to and accepted by the County Geologist.</p>	
<p>4.10.2 <i>Like all of Southern California, Riverside County has and will continue to be subject to ground shaking resulting from activity on local and regional faults. Future development permitted by the proposed General Plan may increase the potential for property loss, injury, or death resulting from this ground shaking hazard. Impacts associated with this issue are potentially significant.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: S 3.3, S 7.7-7.9, S 7.11, S 7.13, S 7.16, S 7.19.</p> <p>4.10.2A The design and construction of structures and facilities shall adhere to the standards and requirement detailed in the California Building Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24), County Building Code, and/or professional engineering standards appropriate for the seismic zone in which such construction may occur. Conformance with these design standards shall be enforced through building plan review and approval by the Riverside County Department of Building and Safety prior to the issuance of building permits for any structure or facility.</p> <p>4.10.2B As determined by the County Geologist, a site-specific assessment shall be prepared to ascertain potential ground shaking impacts resulting from development. The site-specific ground shaking assessment shall incorporate up-to-date data from government</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Safety Policies S 3.3, 7.7-7.9, 7.11, 7.13, 7.16, and 7.19, relating to minimizing ground shaking hazards. These policies, however, do not provide specific development standards for development within areas subject to potential ground shaking impacts that may be identified through the use of new scientific data, equipment, or procedures. To provide adequate mitigation for potential ground shaking hazards, Mitigation Measures 4.10.2A, 4.10.2B, and 4.10.2C were proposed. The implementation of these mitigation measures will further reduce this impact by providing flexibility to the County in requiring site-specific ground shaking assessment for any development subject to potential ground shaking impacts and requiring adherence to identified design standards. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding impacts associated with this issue, see DEIR, Section 4.10.3, pp. 4.10-30 to 4.10-36.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>and non-government sources and may be included as part of any site-specific geotechnical investigation required in Mitigation Measure 4.10.1A. The site-specific ground shaking assessment shall include specific measures to reduce the significance of potential ground shaking hazards.</p> <p>This site-specific ground shaking assessment shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits.</p> <p>4.10.2C The standards stated in Mitigation Measures 4.10.2A and 4.10.2B shall apply to any structure or facility that undergoes, expansion, remodeling, renovation, refurbishment or other modification.</p>	
<p>4.10.3 <i>Portions of unincorporated Riverside County are susceptible to liquefaction, a destructive secondary effect of strong seismic shaking. Future proposed General Plan development within Riverside County would increase the potential for the placement of</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: S 2.2-2.4, S 7.7b.</p> <p>4.10.3A As determined by the County Geologist, a site-specific assessment shall be prepared to ascertain potential liquefaction impacts resulting from development. The site-specific liquefaction assessment shall incorporate up-to-date data from government and non-government sources and may be included as part of any site-specific</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Safety Policies 2.2-2.4, and 7.7b. These policies, however, do not provide specific development standards for development within areas subject to liquefaction, nor do they provide adequate mitigation for potential liquefaction impacts that may be identified through the use of new scientific data, equipment, or procedures. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 4.10.3A, and 4.10.3B were proposed, which will further reduce this impact by providing flexibility to the County to require site-specific liquefaction assessments. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>structures and facilities in or near areas susceptible to liquefaction. Impacts associated with this issue are potentially significant</i></p>		<p>geotechnical investigation required in Mitigation Measure 4.10.1A. This site-specific ground shaking assessment shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits.</p> <p>4.10.3B Where development is proposed within an identified or potential liquefaction hazard area (as determined by the County Geologist), adequate and appropriate measures such as (but not limited to) design foundations in a manner that limits the effects of liquefaction, the placement of an engineered fill with low liquefaction potential, and the alternative siting of structures in areas with a lower liquefaction risk, shall be implemented to reduce potential liquefaction hazards. Any such measures shall be submitted to the Riverside County Geologist and the County Department of Building and Safety for review prior to the approval of the building permits.</p>	<p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding impacts associated with this issue, see DEIR, section 4.10.3, pp. 4.10-36 to 4.10-38.</p>
<p>4.10.4 <i>Landslides and rockfalls can be expected to occur throughout Riverside County, as a result of seismic activity and other natural processes, or as the result of human activity. Future</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: S 2.5, S 3.1-3.2, S 3.4-3.7, LU 11.1c, LU 11.1e, LU 11.1f.</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>The Board finds that implementation of proposed General Plan Safety Policies 2.5, 3.1-3.2, 3.4-3.7, and proposed General Plan Land Use Policies 11.1c, 11.1e, and 11.1f will reduce to a less than significant level the potential impacts associated with development in areas of steep slopes. The Board therefore finds that no additional mitigation measures are required.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>proposed General Plan development within the County would increase the potential for the placement of structures and facilities in areas susceptible to landslides or rockfalls. Impacts associated with this issue are potentially significant.</i></p>			<p>For additional discussion regarding impacts associated with this issue, see DEIR, Section 4.10.3, pp. 4.10-38 to 4.10-39.</p>
<p>4.10.5 <i>Strong ground shaking can cause the densification of soils, resulting in local or regional settlement of the ground surface. Local differential settlement of soils can damage structures. Future proposed General Plan development within Riverside County would increase the potential for the placement of structures and facilities (including infrastructure) in areas susceptible to seismically induced settlement. Impacts related to this issue are potentially significant.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: S 2.2, S 2.6-2.8.</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>The Board finds that implementation of proposed General Plan Safety Policies 2.2, and 2.6-2.8 would reduce to a less than significant level potential impacts associated with seismically induced ground settlement. The Board therefore finds that no additional mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding impacts associated with this issue, see DEIR, Section 4.10.3, pp. 4.10-40 to 4.10-41.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p>4.10.6 <i>Soils susceptible to subsidence, hydroconsolidation, or soil collapse may be affected by a variety of natural or human activities, including earthquakes and the withdrawal of subsurface fluids. Future proposed General Plan development within Riverside County would increase the potential for the placement of structures and facilities in areas susceptible to subsidence and soil collapse. Impacts related to this issue are potentially significant.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: S 3.8-3.10, S 7.12.</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>The Board finds that implementation of proposed General Plan Safety Policies 3.8-3.10, and 7.12 would reduce to a less than significant level potential impacts associated with development in areas of documented or highly susceptible to subsidence. The Board therefore finds that no additional mitigation measures are required</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding impacts associated with this issue, see DEIR, Section 4.10.3, pp. 4.10-41 to 4.10-42.</p>
<p>4.10.7 <i>Expansive soils are widely distributed throughout Riverside County. Future development within Riverside County would increase the potential for the placement of structures and facilities in areas susceptible to damage resulting from expansive soils. Impacts associated with expansive</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>4.10.7A Proponents of new development within Riverside County shall adhere to applicable policies and standards contained in the most recent version of the Uniform Building Code related to the construction of structures and facilities on expansive soils.</p>	<p>The proposed General Plan does not include specific policies that would reduce the significance of potential impacts resulting from development on expansive soils. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.10.7A was proposed, which, when implemented, will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.</p> <p>The Board finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding impacts associated with this issue, see</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<i>soils are considered potentially significant.</i>			DEIR, Section 4.10.3, p. 4.10-42.
<p>4.10.8 <i>Erosion of soils by winds and windblown sand are an environmentally limiting factor throughout much of Riverside County, especially in the Coachella Valley and Eastern Riverside County. Future development within Riverside County would increase the potential for the placement of structures and facilities in areas susceptible to windblown erosion and blow-sand hazards. Impacts related to this issue are potentially significant.</i></p>	LS	<p>Policies: S 3.11-3.14.</p> <p>4.10.8A New development within identified or potential (as determined by the County Geologist) wind hazard areas shall adhere to applicable provisions of County of Riverside Ordinance 484.2 or other local, State, or federal requirements established to control or limit the windborne erosion of soil. Prior to the approval of development permits, the County Building and Safety Department shall confirm that the design of any proposed structure, facility, or use incorporates appropriate features to control and/or limit the windborne erosion of soil.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Safety Policies 3.11-3.14. These policies, however, do not include a mechanism for the implementation of site-specific measures to reduce potential wind erosion hazards. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.10.8A was proposed, which will further reduce this impact by requiring that site-specific design features be incorporated into structures and facilities developed within wind hazard zones. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding impacts associated with this issue, see DEIR, Section 4.10.3, pp. 4.10-43 to 4.10-44.</p>
<p>4.10.9 <i>Areas exposed during development activities would be prone to erosion and/or the loss of topsoil. The potential for substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil is considered potentially significant.</i></p>	LS	<p>4.10.9A Riverside County, where required, and in accordance with issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, shall require the construction and/or grading contractor for individual developments to establish and implement specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) at time of project implementation.</p> <p>4.10.9B Prior to any development within the</p>	<p>The proposed General Plan does not include specific policies that would reduce the significance of potential soil erosion impacts. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 4.10.9A, 4.10.9B, and 4.10.9C were proposed. The implementation of these mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>County, a Grading Plan shall be submitted to the Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside County Geologist for review and approval. As required by the County, the grading plan shall include erosion and sediment control plans. Measures included in individual erosion control plans may include, but shall not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Grading and development plans shall be designed in a manner which minimizes the amount of terrain modification. b. Surface water shall be controlled and diverted around potential landslide areas to prevent erosion and saturation of slopes. c. Structures shall not be sited on or below identified landslides unless slides are stabilized. d. The extent and duration of ground disturbing activities during and immediately following periods of rain shall be limited, to avoid the potential for erosion which may be accelerated by rainfall on exposed soils. e. To the extent possible, the amount of cut and fill shall be balanced. f. The amount of water entering and exiting a graded site shall be limited though the placement of interceptor trenches or other 	<p>For additional discussion regarding impacts associated with this issue, see DEIR, Section 4.10.3, pp. 4.10-44 to 4.10-45.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>erosion control devices.</p> <p>g. Erosion and sediment control plans shall be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits.</p> <p>4.10.9C Where required, drainage design measures shall be incorporated into the final design of individual projects on-site. These measures shall include, but will not be limited to:</p> <p>a. Runoff entering developing areas shall be collected into surface and subsurface drains for removal to nearby drainages.</p> <p>b. Runoff generated above steep slopes or poorly vegetated areas shall be captured and conveyed to nearby drainages.</p> <p>c. Runoff generated on paved or covered areas shall be conveyed via swales and drains to natural drainage courses.</p> <p>d. Disturbed areas that have been identified as highly erosive shall be (re)vegetated.</p> <p>e. Irrigation systems shall be designed, installed, and maintained in a manner which minimizes runoff.</p> <p>f. The landscape scheme for projects within the project site shall utilize drought-tolerant plants.</p> <p>g. Erosion control devices such as rip-rap,</p>	

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		gabions, small check dams, etc., may be utilized in gullies and active stream channels to reduce erosion.	
4.11 Hazardous Materials			
Less than significant impacts were identified. (See DEIR, pp. 4.11-1 to 4.11-6.)	LS	No mitigation measures proposed.	
4.12 Mineral Resources			
Less than significant impacts were identified. (See DEIR, pp. 4.12-1 to 4.12-8.)	LS	No mitigation measures proposed.	
4.13 Noise			
<p>4.13.1 <i>Noise levels from grading and other construction activities would potentially result in noise levels reaching 91 dBA L_{max} at off-site locations 50 feet from the site boundary. This would result in potentially significant noise impacts to off-site sensitive receptors adjacent to the individual construction site. Compliance with the County's noise ordinance</i></p>	LS	<p>Policies: N 12.1-12.4.</p> <p>4.13.1A Prior to the issuance of any grading plans, the County shall condition approval of subdivisions adjacent to any developed/occupied noise-sensitive land uses by requiring applicants to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the County for review and approval. The plan should depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of the project through the use of such methods as:</p>	<p>Short-term noise impacts would be associated with excavation, grading, and erecting buildings during construction of individual projects allowed through the implementation of the proposed General Plan. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area today, but would no longer occur once construction of the project is completed.</p> <p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Noise Policies 12.1-12.4. While these policies provide guidance and some standards for reducing noise impacts due to construction, significant impacts could remain. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 4.13.1A and 4.13.1B were proposed which will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
-----------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

<p><i>construction hours would be required to reduce construction-related noise impacts to a less than significant level.</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C The construction contractor shall use temporary noise attenuation fences where feasible, to reduce construction noise impacts on adjacent noise sensitive land uses. C During all project site excavation and grading on site, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards. The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site. C The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction. C The construction contractor shall limit all construction-related activities that would result in high noise levels to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. No construction shall be allowed on Sundays and public holidays. 	<p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project's short term construction noise impacts, see DEIR, Section 4.13.3, pp. 4.13-97 to 4.13-101.</p>
---	--	---	---

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>4.13.1B The construction-related noise mitigation plan required shall also specify that haul truck deliveries be subject to the same hours specified for construction equipment. Additionally, the plan shall denote any construction traffic haul routes where heavy trucks would exceed 100 daily trips (counting those both to and from the construction site). To the extent feasible, the plan shall denote haul routes that do not pass sensitive land uses or residential dwellings. Lastly, the construction-related noise mitigation plan shall incorporate any other restrictions imposed by County staff.</p>	
<p>4.13.2 <i>The implementation of the proposed General Plan update would result in potential project-related long-term vehicular noise that would affect sensitive land uses along the roads. New development, particularly residential uses along and adjacent to major transit corridors, could be exposed to excessive traffic-related noise levels. To ensure that all new noise-sensitive proposals are</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: N 6.1-6.4, N 7.4, N 8.1-8.7.</p> <p>4.13.2A All new residential developments within the County shall conform to a noise exposure standard of 65 dBA L_{dn} for outdoor noise in noise-sensitive outdoor activity areas and 45 dBA L_{dn} for indoor noise in bedrooms and living/family rooms. New development, which does not and cannot be made to conform to this standard, shall not be permitted.</p> <p>4.13.2B Acoustical studies, describing how the exterior and interior noise standards will be met, shall be required for all new residential developments with a noise exposure greater</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Noise Policies 6.1-6.4, and 8.1-8.7 relating to mobile and vehicular noise sources. Although these policies reduce the effect of mobile and vehicular noise on sensitive land uses, significant impacts could still occur with regard to mobile noise sources. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 4.13.2A, 4.13.2B and 4.13.2C were proposed, which will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s long term vehicular</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>carefully reviewed with respect to potential noise impacts, the County shall review new development using noise guidelines in combination with the land use compatibility standards.</i></p>		<p>than 65 dBA L_{dn}. The studies shall also satisfy the requirements set forth in Title 24, Part 2, or the California Administrative Code, Noise Insulation Standards, for multiple family attached homes, hotels, motels, etc., regulated by Title 24. No development permits or approval of land use applications shall be issued until an acoustic analysis is received and approved by the County Planning Department.</p> <p>4.13.2C The County shall require that proposed new commercial and industrial developments prepare acoustical studies, analyzing potential noise impacts on adjacent properties, when these developments abut noise-sensitive land uses. The County will require that all direct impacts to noise-sensitive land uses be mitigated to the maximum extent practicable.</p> <p>4.13.2D Ensure that all new schools, particularly in subdivisions and specific plans, are sited an appropriate distance away from any airport.</p>	<p>traffic noise impacts, see General Plan section 4.13.3, pp. 4.13-101 to 4.13-103.</p>
<p>4.13.3 <i>New development associated with implementation of the proposed General Plan could expose existing and/or</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: N 1.1-1.8, N 2.1-2.3, N 3.1-3.7, N 4.1-4.8, N 11.1-11.2, and N 13.1-13.9.</p> <p>4.13.3A Acoustical studies shall be required for all new noise-sensitive projects that may be</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Noise Policies 1.1-1.8, 2.1-2.3, 3.1-3.7, 4.1-4.8, 11.1-11.2 and 13.1-13.9. Although these policies will reduce the effect of stationary noise producers on sensitive land uses, the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.13.3A, 4.13.3B and 4.13.3C</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>new sensitive uses to stationary noise sources, such as industrial and/or commercial uses.</i></p>		<p>affected by existing noise from stationary sources.</p> <p>4.13.3B To permit new development of residential and noise-sensitive land uses where existing stationary noise sources exceed the County’s noise standards, effective mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce noise exposure to or below the allowable levels of the zoning code/noise control ordinance.</p> <p>4.13.3C No industrial facilities shall be constructed within 500 feet of any commercial land uses or within 2,800 feet of any residential uses without the preparation of a noise impact analysis. This analysis shall document the nature of the industrial facility as well as “noise producing” operations associated with that facility. Furthermore, the analysis shall document the placement of any existing or proposed commercial or residential land uses situated within the noted distances. The analysis shall determine the potential noise levels that could be received at these commercial and/or residential land uses and specify measures to be employed by the industrial facility to ensure that these levels do not exceed County noise requirements. Such measures could include, but are not limited to, the use of enclosures for noisy pieces of</p>	<p>will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s long term stationary source noise impacts, see General Plan section 4.13.3, pp. 4.13-103 to 4.13-107.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>equipment, the use of noise walls and/or berms for exterior equipment and/or on-site truck operations, and/or restrictions on hours of operations. No development permits or approval of land use applications shall be issued until an acoustic analysis is received and approved by the County staff.</p>	
<p>4.13.4 <i>Although the proposed General Plan update would not necessarily result in potential project-related increases in railroad noise, there could be new proposed sensitive land uses along and adjacent to the railroads that would be affected by high railroad noise.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: N 10.1-10.5.</p> <p>4.13.4A All new residential developments within the County shall conform to a noise exposure standard of 65 dBA L_{dn} for outdoor noise in noise-sensitive outdoor activity areas and 45 dBA L_{dn} for indoor noise in bedrooms and living/family rooms. New development, which does not and cannot be made to conform to this standard, shall not be permitted.</p> <p>4.13.4B Acoustical studies, describing how the exterior and interior noise standards will be met, shall be required for all new residential developments with a noise exposure greater than 65 dBA L_{dn}. The studies should also satisfy the requirements set forth in Title 24, Part 2, or the California Administrative Code, Noise Insulation Standards, for multiple family attached homes, hotels, motels, etc., regulated by Title 24.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Noise Policies 10.1-10.5. Although these policies reduce the effect of railroad noise on sensitive land uses, Mitigation Measures 4.13.3A, and 4.13.2B will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s long term railroad noise impacts, see General Plan section 4.13.3, pp. 4.13-107 to 4.13-108.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
-----------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

4.14 Parks and Recreation

<p>4.14.1 <i>Build out within now vacant unincorporated areas of the County will result in a substantial increase in population, residential and non-residential structures; potentially increasing the use of existing parks and recreation facilities. Based on increased population figures and current staffing levels, development associated with the proposed General Plan would require additional neighborhood and/or community parkland and recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed General Plan could result in significant impacts on existing parks, recreation services and facilities. These impacts will require the expansion of existing facilities and recreation programs or the construction of new parks and recreational facilities. An increase in staff and/or</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: OS 20.3, OS 20.5-20.6, LU 19.1-19.3, LU 19.5.</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>Proposed General Plan Open Space Policies 20.3, 20.5-20.6, and Land Use Policies 19.1-19.3, and 19.5 would reduce to a less than significant level the effects of growth and development on park and recreation facilities and/or services through performance standards that will guarantee that future residents of the County will be provided with adequate parks and recreation facilities. Implementation of these policies will lessen the potential impacts on park and recreation facilities and/or services to a less than significant level. The Board therefore finds that no additional mitigation measures are required. The Board finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to parks and recreation, see DEIR, Section 4.14.3, pp. 4.14-6 to 4.14-7.</p>
---	-----------	---	---

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<i>equipment will be needed to maintain the new parkland and recreational facilities.</i>			
4.15 Public Services			
<p>4.15.1 <i>Build out of unincorporated areas of the County will result in a substantial increase in population and residential and non-residential structures, increasing the need for fire emergency services and facilities. Based on increased population figures and current staffing levels, development associated with the proposed General Plan would require additional on-duty firefighters. Therefore, the proposed General Plan could result in significant impacts on existing fire protection services and require expansion of fire protection services.</i></p>	LS	<p>Policies: S 5.2, S 5.4-5.9, LU 5.1-5.2, LU 9.1.</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>The Board finds that implementation of proposed General Plan Safety Policies 5.2, 5.4-5.9, and Land Use Policies 5.1, 5.2 and 9.1, in addition to Riverside County Ordinance No. 787, Riverside County Master Fire Protection Plan, the California Public Resources Code No. 4290, the Uniform Fire Code, and the Uniform Building Code, will reduce to a less than significant level the effects of development on fire protection service. The Board therefore finds that no additional mitigation measures are required. The Board finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impacts to fire protection, see DEIR, Section 4.15.1, pp. 4.15-3 to 4.15-6.</p>
<p>4.15.2 <i>Increases in population and employment</i></p>	LS	<p>Policies: LU 5.1-5.2, LU 9.1.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Land Use Policies 5.1-5.2, and</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>anticipated with the proposed General Plan would increase the need for sheriff protection and sheriff services, requiring additional emergency responses and the need for additional sheriff personnel and related support facilities. This increased demand for officers and facilities is considered a significant impact.</i></p>		<p>4.15.2A The County shall require as a part of the development review process, proponents of new businesses, recreational, and commercial land uses such as shopping centers, health clubs, large hotels over 200 rooms, convention centers, and commercial recreational activities be required to provide on-site security.</p> <p>4.15.2B The TLMA shall inform the Riverside County Sheriff’s Department of the existence of all new homeowner’s associations within the County. The Riverside County Sheriff’s Department shall coordinate with homeowner’s associations to establish a Neighborhood Watch Program.</p> <p>4.15.2C Riverside County shall meet and maintain a goal of 1.5 sworn officers per 1,000 population, as recommended by the International City Managers’ Association.</p> <p>4.15.2D The County shall require the development applicant to pay the County Sheriff’s established development mitigation fee prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy on any structure as they are developed. The fees are for the acquisition and construction of public facilities.</p>	<p>9.1. These policies, however, do not ensure that communities and large private facilities will provide private security, nor do the policies set specific levels of service. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 4.15.2A, 4.15.2B, 4.15.2C, and 4.15.2D were proposed, which will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to sheriff protection services, see DEIR, Section 4.15.2, pp. 4.15-7 to 4.15-9.</p>
<p>4.15.3 <i>Increases in</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: LU 5.1, LU 5.2.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>population and employment with the proposed General Plan could result in the incremental increase of solid waste throughout unincorporated Riverside County. This could increase the need for solid waste disposal, requiring additional landfill capacity and related support facilities. This increase is considered substantial and could result in a significant impact on existing solid waste facilities.</i></p>		<p>4.15.3A Riverside County shall work with its franchise hauling companies to expand curbside and commercial recycling services throughout the unincorporated area of the County.</p> <p>4.15.3B Riverside County shall follow State regulations in implementing the goals, policies, and programs identified in the Riverside County Integrated Waste Management Plan in order to achieve and maintain a 50 percent reduction in solid waste disposal through source reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting.</p> <p>4.15.3C In accordance with State regulations, Riverside County shall prepare an annual report of progress for the CIWMB to determine the County’s progress toward meeting its diversion goals and objectives, to project the County’s waste disposal needs, and to determine if any of the elements that comprise the Riverside CIWMP require revision to include additional disposal capacity, reflect new or changed local and regional solid waste management issues, or reflect new or changed goals and objectives.</p> <p>4.15.3D In accordance with CCR Section 18788, Riverside County shall review the Riverside CIWMP every five years to</p>	<p>implementation of proposed General Plan Land Use Policies 5.1 and 5.2. These policies focus on the assurance that development does not overwhelm the solid waste management infrastructure system. The policies do not discuss solid waste reduction or recycling, nor do they discuss specific goals and progress reports. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 4.15.3A, 4.15.3B, 4.15.3C, 4.15.3D, 4.15.3E, and 4.15.3F were proposed, which will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to waste disposal facilities, see DEIR, Section 4.15.3, pp. 4.15-<u>13</u> to 4.15-16.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>determine if the County’s waste management practices remain consistent with waste diversion goals and objectives and to assess if revision is required.</p> <p>4.15.3E The County shall require all future commercial, industrial and multi-family residential development to provide adequate areas for the collection and loading of recyclable materials (i.e., paper products, glass, and other recyclables) in compliance with the State Model Ordinance, implemented on September 1, 1994, in accordance with AB 1327, Chapter 18, California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991.</p> <p>4.15.3F The County shall require all development projects to coordinate with appropriate County departments and/or agencies to ensure that there is adequate waste disposal capacity to meet the waste disposal requirements of the project, and the County shall recommend that all development projects incorporate measures to promote waste reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting.</p>	
<p>4.15.4.1 <i>Implementation of the proposed General Plan would generate increases in</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: LU 5.1-5.2, LU 9.1, OS 3.1.</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>The Board finds that implementation of proposed General Plan Land Use Policies 5.1, 5.2, and 9.1, and Open Space Policy 3.1, will ensure adequate wastewater facilities as development occurs, thereby reducing the effects of</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>population and housing, in addition to increases of commercial, and industrial land uses. This growth would incrementally generate wastewater, which will necessitate increased wastewater treatment capacity. Due to the large-scale projected growth, this increase is considered substantial and may result in a significant impact on existing wastewater service and facilities.</i></p>			<p>future development to a less than significant level. The Board therefore finds that no additional mitigation measures are required. The Board further finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to wastewater treatment facilities, see DEIR, Section 4.15.4, pp. 4.15-17 to 4.15-18.</p>
<p>4.15.4.2 <i>The proliferation of septic systems in rural communities may potentially contaminate groundwater with nitrates, ammonia, salts, metals, organic solvents, grease and oil, and other substances, impairing the beneficial uses of local water supplies. This is a potentially significant impact.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: OS 3.2.</p> <p>4.15.4A. Conventional septic tanks/subsurface disposal systems shall be prohibited within any designated Zone A of an Environmental Protection Agency wellhead protection area. Where a difference between Riverside County and EPA septic tank setback distance requirements exists, the EPA standard shall apply.</p>	<p>The Board finds that implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policy 3.2, will reduce the effects of future development on water quality from septic facilities. The Rancho California Water District noted that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has established stricter standards governing the placement of septic systems in the proximity of water wells so as to avoid contamination of groundwater by discharges from subsurface disposal systems. The District recommended that the County include a mitigation measure ensuring compliance with the EPA’s standard. The County agreed and revised the EIR to include Mitigation Measure 4.15.4A. (FEIR, pp. 2-125 to 2-126, 2-129 to 2-130.) The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted.</p> <p>The Board finds that implementation of Open Space Policy OS 3.2 and this mitigation measure will reduce the impacts associated with septic</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
			<p>systems to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Board further finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to wastewater treatment facilities, see DEIR, Section 4.15.4, pp. 4.15-18 to 4.15-19.</p>
<p>4.15.5 <i>Implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in increased development and associated student population throughout the unincorporated areas of the County. Most school districts either cannot meet their current need or will be unable to meet future needs resulting from projected growth.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: LU 5.2; implementation of Leroy F. Green School Facilities Act of 1998 (SB 50).</p> <p>No mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>State law limits the power of the County to impose mitigation for development impacts on schools. The Board finds that implementation of proposed General Plan Land Use Policy 5.2, as well as compliance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (SB50), will provide full and complete school facilities mitigation. The Board therefore finds that no additional mitigation measures are required. The Board further finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to schools, see DEIR, Section 4.15.5, pp. 4.15-21 to 4.15-23.</p>
<p>4.15.6 <i>The population increase anticipated in the proposed Riverside County General Plan would potentially increase the use of existing library facilities and services to the extent that the construction and/or expansion of facilities would be required.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: LU 5.1.</p> <p>4.15.6A Riverside County shall provide a minimum of approximately 0.5 square foot of library space and 2.5 volumes per County resident.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Land Use Policy 5.1. This policy focuses on the ability to provide adequate library services. However, the policy does not set specific standards for libraries. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.15.6A was proposed, which will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of this policy and mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
			<p>changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to libraries, see DEIR, Section 4.15.6, pp. 4.15-24 to 4.15-25.</p>
<p>4.15.7 <i>The population increase to 1.67 million people in the County over the next 40 years anticipated with the implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase the demand of existing medical facilities and services beyond what is currently available. Projected growth may have a significant impact on medical facilities and services in Riverside County.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: LU 5.1.</p> <p>4.15.7A Riverside County shall perform a periodic medical needs assessment to evaluate the current medical demand and level of medical service provided within each Area Plan. A periodic medical needs assessment shall be conducted every three years.</p> <p>4.15.7B Riverside County shall fund the new construction and/or expansion of existing medical facilities according to the level of demand for medical services. The level of demand will be based on and determined by the outcome of the periodic medical needs assessments.</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Land Use Policy 5.1. This policy focuses on the ability to provide adequate medical facilities and services. However, the policy does not specifically detail how and when the adequacy of the facilities and services will be determined. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 4.15.7A, and 4.15.7B were proposed, which will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of this policy and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to medical facilities and/or services, see DEIR, Section 4.15.7, pp. 4.15-26 to 4.15-27.</p>
<p>4.16 Transportation</p>			
<p>4.16.1 <i>Future growth occurring as the result of implementing the proposed 2002 Riverside County General Plan will increase area-wide traffic volumes</i></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Policies: C1.1-1.7, C2.1, C2.3, C2.6-C2.7, C3.2, C3.5-3.6, C3.10, C3.20, C4.1-4.10, C6.1-6.7, C7.1-7.6, C8.4-8.6, C8.8, C9.1-9.2, C10.1, C11.1-11.7, C12.1-12.6, C13.1-13.7, C14.2, C15.1-15.2, C16.1-16.2, C16.5, C16.8, C16.11, C16.14-16.17, C16.19-16.20, C17.2, C18.2-</p>	<p>Implementation of these proposed policies and mitigation measures will reduce a majority of the potential impacts on the County’s arterial transportation and circulation system to less than significant, with the exception of the arterial locations identified on Figures 4.16.10 and 4.16.12 of the DEIR. For those identified locations, the County’s LOS threshold of LOS D will not be met and the impact from implementation</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>with the potential to degrade roadway and freeway performance below applicable performance standards.</i></p>		<p>18.2 3, C18.5-18.8, C19.1-19.12, C21.1-21.5, C21.8-21.9, C21.11-21.13, C22.1-22.9, C23.1-23.2, C25.1</p> <p>4.16.1A As part of its review of land development proposals, the County shall require project proponents to make a “fair share” contribution to required intersection and/or roadway improvements. The required intersection and/or roadway improvements shall be based on maintaining the appropriate level of service (LOS D within Community Development Areas designated by the 20023 Riverside County General Plan and within adjacent jurisdictions; LOS C within those portions of unincorporated Riverside County outside of Community Development Areas). The fair share contribution shall be based on the percentage of project-related traffic to the total future traffic.</p> <p>4.16.1B As part of its review of land development proposals, the County shall ensure sufficient right-of-way is reserved on critical roadways and at critical intersections to implement the approach lane geometrics necessary to provide the appropriate levels of services.</p> <p>4.16.1C The County shall add a transportation</p>	<p>of the proposed General Plan is considered significant. In addition, Circulation Element Policy 2.5 of the proposed General Plan provides a mechanism for the County to approve projects that do not meet their own LOS standards, based on a determination that the project is a benefit even though the LOS standards are not met. With implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and the mitigation measures identified in the EIR, significant and unavoidable impacts will remain at those locations shown in Figures 4.16.10 and 4.16.12 and potentially at other locations through implementation of Circulation Element Policy 2.5.</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed policies and mitigation measures would reduce a majority of the potential impacts on the freeway system located within the County to less than significant, with the exception of freeway locations shown on figures 4.16.10 and 4.16.12 of the DEIR. For those identified locations, the County’s LOS threshold of LOS E will not be met. There is no mechanism for development project proponents to pay fees or make fair share contributions towards improving mainline freeway lanes, and even if there were such a mechanism, there is no way to ensure that such payments would be directed to a specific freeway improvement project. Consequently, there are no feasible mitigation measures for these impacts and they will remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>For additional discussion of the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts to transportation/circulation, see DEIR, Section 4.6.3, pp. 4.16-12 to 4.16-68, Section 5.1.3, pp. 5-2 to 5-3 and Section 5.4, pp. 5-16 to 5-17.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>corridor to its General Plan Circulation Element, if feasible, showing a connection between I-15 and the Orange County freeway system, and complete that portion of the CETAP program involving the bi-County corridor to Orange County as a means of relieving traffic congestion along State Route 91. The transportation corridor shall provide an alternative route for traffic on State Route 91 between I-15 and State Route 241.</p>	
4.17 Water Resources			
<p>4.17.1 <i>The population increases projected for Riverside County with implementation of the proposed General Plan will increase the demand for water beyond that which currently exists. A significant impact will occur when and where the demand for water exceeds supply.</i></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Policies: OS 1.1-1.3, OS 2.1-2.5, LU 5.3, LU 17.2.</p> <p>4.17.1A Proponents of new development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County that consist of: a residential development of more than 500 dwelling units; a shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space; a commercial office building employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space; a hotel/motel development of more than 5,000 rooms; an industrial, manufacturing/processing plant, or industrial park employing more than 1,000 persons or occupying more than 650,000 square feet of floor space or 40 acres of land; a</p>	<p>While adherence to the stated policies in the proposed General Plan and mitigation in the EIR will reduce potential impacts to water supply, in the absence of project-specific water supply data, potential water supply impacts (including groundwater) resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan must be considered significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Mitigation measures 4.17.1A, 4.17.1B, 4.17.1C, 4.17.1D, and 4.17.1E will reduce, but not avoid, the adverse effect associated with this impact. Therefore, the Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The Board finds that there are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that the Board could adopt at this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact, therefore, remains significant and unmitigable. To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less-than-significant) level, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations support approval of the Project as modified by the adopted mitigation measures, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
-----------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

		<p>mixed-use development that includes any of the previously referenced projects; or a project with a water demand equivalent to that used by 500 residential units shall be required to submit a water supply assessment prior to approval of a project. The water supply assessment shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C Project description; C Water resources environmental setting; C Conservation and water recycling measures included in the project; C The identification of existing water entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts relevant to the water supply identified for a proposed project, and the amount of water received pursuant to such entitlements, rights, or contracts; C Project water demand; C Water supply alternatives; C Preferred water supply alternative; C Impacts associated with use of the preferred water supply alternative; C Evaluation of compliance with the applicable Urban Water Management Plan; C Summary and conclusions; and 	<p>For additional discussion of the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts to water resources, see DEIR, Section 4.17.3, pp. 4.17-13 to 4.17-18, Section 5.1.4, p. 5-3, and Section 5.4, p. 5-17.</p>
--	--	---	--

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
-----------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

		<p>C Technical appendices and attachment of supporting documents.</p> <p>Said water supply assessment shall be submitted to the County and applicable water supply agencies for review. Development shall not be permitted unless an adequate supply of water, available for use and sufficient to supply a proposed project, in wet and drought years, has been identified. Where water supply adequate to supply a project in its entirety does not exist, development of only those portions of a project with an adequate and available water supply shall be permitted. Evidence of the availability of adequate water supply shall be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to the issuance of development permits.</p> <p>4.17.1B For projects smaller than those stated in Mitigation Measure 4.17.1A, the County shall require evidence that the project is in compliance with the Urban Water Management Plan for the area in which the development is located, prior to the issuance of development permits. Evidence of such compliance shall take the form of written verification by the water provider that the project is in compliance with said plan. As determined necessary by the County, preparation of a water supply plan (as</p>	
--	--	---	--

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>required in Mitigation Measure 4.17.1A, above) shall be required for a project that is estimated to use less than 250 af per year, prior to the issuance of development permits.</p> <p>To help bridge the projected gap between water supply and water demand, the following water conservation measures shall be required:</p> <p>4.17.1C Development within unincorporated areas of the County shall not use water of any source of quality suitable for potable domestic use for nonpotable uses, including cemeteries, golf courses, parks, highway landscaped areas, industrial and irrigation uses, or other non-domestic use if suitable recycled water is available as provided in Sections 13550-13566 of the State Water Code and/or Sections 65591-65600 and 65601-65607 of the State Public Resource Code. Prior to the issuance of any land use permit, the County shall determine to what extent and in which manner the use of recycled water is required for individual water projects. Future development shall be designed, constructed, and maintained <u>in</u> accordance with the recycled water measures mandated by the County.</p> <p>4.17.1D Riverside County shall enforce compliance with federal, State, and local</p>	

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>standards for water conservation within residential, commercial, or industrial projects. Prior to approval of any development within the County, the applicant shall submit evidence to Riverside County that all applicable water conservation measures have been met.</p> <p>4.17.1E For any development within the Palo Verde Planning Area supplied with water from the Colorado River, the project applicant shall enter into a contract with the City of Needles, pursuant to the “Lower Colorado Water Supply Project” program. Evidence of such a contractual agreement shall be submitted to the County prior to the approval of any development entitlement for the project.</p>	
<p>4.17.2 <i>Accommodation of the population increase anticipated at build out of the proposed General Plan will likely require the increased reliance on groundwater sources. This is especially likely in the western part of Riverside County where most of the population growth is expected to occur. Increased and new uses may conflict</i></p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>Policies: OS 1.1-1.3, OS 2.1-2.5, OS 4.1-4.7, LU 5.3, LU 17.2.</p> <p>4.17.2A In areas where it is not practical to conserve soils suitable for recharge (as determined by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District), water harvesting and recharge facilities shall be built within the same groundwater basin in which the recharge area is lost. The construction of “replacement” recharge areas shall equal the amount of recharge area lost and/or shall incorporate equipment or facilities</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies 1.1-1.3, 2.1-2.5, and 4.1-4.7, and Land Use Policies 5.3 and 17.2, although it remains uncertain if sufficient water supplies are available to accommodate the development envisioned in the proposed General Plan. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.17.2A was proposed, which will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted.</p> <p>While the implementation of proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to groundwater supply, significant impacts could remain. The Board finds that there are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that the Board could adopt at this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
<p><i>with a groundwater management plan, monitoring program, or lead to groundwater extraction that either individually or cumulatively exceed the safe yields of groundwater basins and/or cause a net deficit in the aquifer volume or reduction in the local groundwater table level. Any such condition would be potentially significant.</i></p>		<p>capable of replacing (at an equal volume) the amount of groundwater recharge capacity lost as a result of development. The identification, designation, location, or installation of “replacement” groundwater recharge capacity shall be reviewed and approved by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District prior to the issuance of grading permits.</p>	<p>level. This impact, therefore, will remain significant and unavoidable. To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less-than-significant) level, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project, despite unavoidable residual impacts.</p> <p>For additional discussion of the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts to groundwater resources, see DEIR, Section 4.17.3, pp. 4.17-18 to 4.17-19, Section 5.1.4, p. 5-3, and Section 5.4, p. 5-17.</p>
<p>4.17.3 <i>The proposed General Plan will accommodate development in vacant areas that are currently available for groundwater recharge. Development of such areas will reduce the area available for aquifer recharge and could substantially interfere with the process of groundwater recharge. This is a potentially significant impact.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: OS 4.1-4.7.</p> <p>4.17.3A New development that includes more than one acre of impervious surface area (including roofs, parking areas, streets, sidewalk, etc.), shall incorporate features to facilitate the on-site infiltration of precipitation and/or runoff into groundwater basins. Such features shall include (but not be limited to): natural drainage systems (where economically feasible), detention basins incorporated into project landscaping; and the installation of porous areas within parking areas. Where natural drainage systems are utilized for groundwater recharge, they shall be managed using natural approaches (as modified to</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies 4.1-4.7. While these policies reduce or minimize potential impacts that implementation of the proposed General Plan may have on groundwater recharge, they do not guarantee that groundwater recharge capacity will be sufficient to maintain the quantity of groundwater reserves. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 4.17.2A, and 4.17.31 were proposed, which will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to groundwater</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		safeguard public health and safety). Groundwater recharge features shall be included on development plans and shall be reviewed by the Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District prior to the issuance of grading permits.	recharge, see DEIR, Section 4.17.3, pp. 4.17-19 to 4.17-21.
<p>4.17.4 <i>The proposed General Plan has the potential to threaten or damage unique hydrologic characteristics or will change hydrologic baseline conditions over an extensive area or period of time, so that resultant conditions are highly controversial, highly uncertain, or involve unique or unknown risks.</i></p>	LS	<p>Policies: OS 5.1-5.3, OS 5.5, LU 28.1.</p> <p>4.17.4A Where development may interfere with, disrupt, or otherwise affect surface or subsurface hydrologic baseline conditions (as determined by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the California Department of Fish and Game, and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board), preparation of a project specific hydrologic study shall be required. The hydrologic study shall include (but shall not be limited to): an inventory of surface and subsurface hydrologic conditions existing at the time of the study; an analysis of how the proposed development would affect these hydrologic baseline conditions; and specific measures to limit or eliminate the interference or disruption of the on-site hydrologic process. The hydrologic study shall evaluate the feasibility of incorporating bioengineering</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies 5.1-5.3, and 5.5, and Land Use Policy 28.1. While these policies will reduce or minimize potential impacts implementation of the proposed General Plan may have on the hydrologic process, they do not provide a mechanism to evaluate how development may alter the hydrologic process. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 4.17.4A, 4.17.4B and 4.17.4C were proposed, which will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to the hydrologic process, see DEIR, Section 4.17.3, pp. 4.17-21 to 4.17-23.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>measures into any project that may alter the hydrologic process. Where required by the County, the hydrologic study shall include analysis of, at an equal level of detail, potential impacts to tributary or downstream areas. The hydrologic study shall be submitted to the County or responsible entity for review and shall be approved prior to the issuance of any entitlement that would result in the physical modification of the project site.</p> <p>4.17.4B The project applicant shall submit to the County for review and approval, evidence that the specific measures to limit or eliminate the disruption or interference to the hydrologic process resulting from the entire development process, will be implemented as set forth in the hydrologic study. Such evidence may take the form of (but shall not be limited to): a development agreement; land banking; the provision of adequate funds to guarantee the construction, maintenance or restoration of hydrologic features; or any other mechanism that will achieve said goals. Said evidence shall be submitted and approved prior to the issuance of any entitlement that would result in the physical modification of the project site.</p> <p>4.17.4C Where determined feasible by the County or responsible entity, bioengineering</p>	

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
----------------------	--	---	------------------

		measures shall be incorporated into any project that may alter the hydrologic process.	
<p>4.17.5 <i>Implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in reliance on a higher percentage of lower quality water sources either from the Colorado River or from marginal groundwater sources, and/or may increase the level of pollutants that occur in local/regional groundwater reserves and/or local/regional surface water. Either of these conditions would result in the deterioration of the quality of water in Riverside County and would be a significant impact.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Policies: OS 3.1-3.3, OS 6.3.</p> <p>4.17.5A The development of septic systems shall be in accordance with applicable standards established by Riverside County and other responsible authorities.</p> <p>4.17.5B Point source pollution reduction programs shall fully adhere to applicable standards required by federal, State, and local agencies. Prior to the approval of individual projects, Riverside County shall verify that the provisions of applicable point source pollution programs have been satisfied.</p> <p>4.17.5C Where development may contribute to a worsening of local or regional ground or surface water quality (as determined by the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health and/or RWQCB), a water quality analysis shall be prepared. The water quality analysis shall include (but shall not be limited to): an analysis of existing surface and subsurface water quality; an assessment of how the proposed development would affect existing water quality; an assessment of how the proposed development would affect</p>	<p>The risks associated with this impact will be minimized through implementation of proposed General Plan Open Space Policies 3.1-3.3, and 6.3. These policies encourage the use of innovative and creative techniques and the consideration of wetlands for water treatment to reduce or minimize potential water quality impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan. The policies do not provide, however, concrete or specific requirements that will reduce potential water quality impacts to below a level of significance. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 4.17.5A, 4.17.5B, 4.17.5C, 4.17.5D and 4.17.5E were proposed, which will further reduce this impact. The Board hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies and mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Board therefore finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>For additional discussion regarding the project’s impact to water quality, see DEIR, Section 4.17.3, pp. 4.17-23 to 4.17-25.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>beneficial uses of the water; and specific measures to limit or eliminate potential water quality impacts and/or impacts to beneficial uses of ground/surface water. Where determined necessary by the County or other responsible entity, the water quality analysis shall include, at an equal level of detail, potential impacts to tributary or downstream areas. The water quality analysis shall be submitted to the County and the RWCQB for review and shall be approved prior to the issuance of any entitlement that would result in the physical modification of the project site.</p> <p>4.17.5D The project applicant shall submit to the County and the RWQCB, for review and approval, evidence that the specific measures to limit or eliminate potential water quality impacts resulting from the entire development process, and will be implemented as set forth in the water quality analysis. Said evidence shall be submitted and approved prior to the issuance of any entitlement that would result in the physical modification of the project site.</p> <p>4.17.5E For each new development project, the following principles and policies shall be considered and implemented:</p> <p>(1) Avoid or limit disturbance to natural water</p>	

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation ¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>bodies and drainage systems (including ephemeral drainage systems) when feasible. Provide adequate buffers of native vegetation along drainage systems to lessen erosion and protect water quality.</p> <p>(2) Appropriate best management practices (BMPs) must be implemented to lessen impacts to waters of the United States and/or waters of the State of California resulting from development. Drainages should be left in a natural condition or modified in a way that preserves all existing water quality standards where feasible. Any discharges of sediment or other wastes, including wastewater, to waters of the United States or waters of the State must be avoided to the maximum extent practicable. All such discharges will require an NPDES permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).</p> <p>(3) Small drainages shall be preserved and incorporated into new development, along with adequate buffer zones of native vegetation, to the maximum extent practicable.</p> <p>(4) Any impacts to waters of the United States require a Section 401 Water Quality Standards Certification from the RWQCB. Impacts to these waters shall be avoided to the maximum</p>	

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>extent practicable. Where avoidance is not practicable, impacts to these waters shall be minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Mitigation of unavoidable impacts must, at a minimum, replace the full function and value of the affected water body. Impacts to waters of the United States also require a Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit from the United States Army Corps of Engineers and a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game.</p> <p>(5) The County shall encourage the use of pervious materials in development to retain absorption and allow more percolation of stormwater into the ground. The use of pervious materials, such as grass, permeable/porous pavement, etc., for runoff channels and parking areas shall also be encouraged. Lining runoff channels with impermeable surfaces, such as concrete or grouted rip-rap, will be discouraged.</p> <p>(6) The County shall encourage construction of detention basins or holding ponds and/or constructed wetlands within a project site to capture and treat dry weather urban runoff and the first flush of rainfall runoff. These basins should be designed to detain runoff for a minimum time, such as 24 hours, to allow</p>	

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>particles and associated pollutants to settle and to provide for natural treatment.</p> <p>(7) The County shall encourage development to retain areas of open space as natural or landscaped to aid in the recharge and retention of runoff. Native plant materials shall be used in replanting and hydroseeding operations, where feasible.</p> <p>(8) The County shall require that environmental documents for proposed projects in areas tributary to Canyon Lake Reservoir, Lake Elsinore, sections of the Santa Ana River, Fulmar Lake, and Mill Creek (as a result of the proposed 2002 303 (d) listing of these water bodies) include discharge prohibitions, revisions to discharge permits, or management plans to address water quality impacts in accordance with the controls that may be applied pursuant to State and Federal regulation. Environmental documents shall acknowledge that additional requirements may be imposed in the future for projects in areas tributary to the water bodies listed above.</p> <p>(9) The County shall ensure that in new development, post-development stormwater runoff flow rates do not differ from the pre-development stormwater runoff flow rates.</p>	

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
		<p>(10) All construction projects should be designed and implemented to protect, and if at all possible, to improve the quality of the underlying groundwater.</p> <p>(11) The County shall encourage the enhancement of groundwater recharge wherever possible. Measures such as keeping stream/river channels and floodplains in natural conditions or with pervious surfaces, as well as keeping areas of high recharge as open space will be considered.</p> <p>(12) The County shall prohibit the discharge of waste material resulting from any type of construction into any drainage areas, channels, streambeds, streams, lakes, wetlands, or rivers. Spoil sites shall be prohibited within any streams or areas where spoil material could be washed into a water body.</p> <p>(13) The County shall require that appropriate BMPs be developed and implemented during construction efforts to control the discharge of pollutants, prevent sewage spills, and to avoid discharge of sediments into the streets, stormwater conveyance channels, or waterways.</p>	

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance w/Mitigation¹	Adopted Policies and/or Mitigation Measures	Findings of Fact
-----------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

¹ Significance with mitigation. LS = Less-than-significant effect. SU = Significant and unavoidable effect. NI = No impact.

C:\Documents and Settings\sbein\Local Settings\Temporary Internet Files\OLK8B\October 8th revised findings chart clean copy.wpd

XIV. **PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

Where a significant impact can be substantially lessened (i.e., mitigated to an “acceptable level”) solely by the adoption of mitigation measures, the lead agency, in drafting its findings, has no obligation to consider the feasibility of alternatives with respect to that impact, even if the alternative would mitigate the impact to a greater degree than the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; *Laurel Hills Homeowners Association, supra*, 83 Cal.App.3d at p. 521; see also *Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 691, 730-731; and *Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400-403.)

Nearly every significant effect identified in the FEIR has been at least substantially lessened, if not fully avoided, by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. There remain a handful of impacts, however, that were identified as significant and unavoidable and which cannot be substantially lessened. Specifically, the proposed General Plan had significant unavoidable adverse impacts on prime farmland, biological resources, air quality, visual resources, water supply, and transportation. (DEIR, p. 6-56.)

Thus, as a legal matter, the Board, in considering alternatives in these findings, need only determine whether any alternatives are environmentally superior with respect to those impacts. If any alternatives are in fact superior with respect to those impacts, the Board is then required to determine whether the alternatives are feasible. If the Board determines that no alternative is both feasible and environmentally superior with respect to the unavoidable significant impacts identified in the DEIR, the Board may approve the proposed project as mitigated, after adopting a statement of overriding considerations.

The DEIR examined the project alternatives in detail, exploring their comparative advantages and disadvantages with respect to the proposed General Plan. (DEIR, pp. 6-3 to 6-59.) As the following discussion demonstrates, however, although some of the alternatives are environmentally superior with respect to certain impacts, none of the alternatives is feasible in light of project objectives and other considerations.

Project Objectives

The objectives of the proposed General Plan are to preserve crucial open space, provide a range of community design options in response to varied lifestyle choices, focus on high quality growth by using land resources efficiently, retain economically valuable agricultural lands, provide a comprehensive transportation system, provide public access to recreation opportunities, and expand local employment opportunities and broaden choices of transportation systems. (DEIR, p. 6-59.)

Alternatives Analysis

The Draft EIR and the Final EIR examined a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project to determine whether any of these alternatives could meet most or all of the Project's objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening its significant, unavoidable impacts. (DEIR, p. 6-1.) Nine alternatives that could potentially meet the project objectives initially were considered as part of the environmental review for the Project. The following six alternatives were selected for further examination:

- No Build Alternative
- No Project Alternative (Existing General Plan)
- Rural Emphasis Alternative
- Less Intense Community Centers Alternative
- More Intense Community Centers Alternative
- Density Bonus Alternative

Of the six project alternatives evaluated, one would result in no physical changes to the environment on the project site (No Build Alternative); one would allow the development according to the density established in existing plans (No Project Alternative); and four would alter the density patterns throughout the unincorporated County (Rural Emphasis Alternative, Less Intense Community Centers Alternative, More Intense Community Centers Alternative, and Density Bonus Alternative). Relocating the proposed project to an alternative site is not feasible, as the proposed General Plan covers the entire Riverside County. Therefore, no alternative site was considered. Each of the six alternatives would result in a combination of similar, avoided or decreased, and increased environmental impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan. (DEIR, pp. 6-56 to 6-58.)

The No Build Alternative would result in greater impacts to mineral resources and transportation and circulation. Impacts under all other categories would be reduced, when compared to the existing General Plan. However, this alternative is not feasible, as it fails to accommodate current and projected growth within the County. (DEIR, p. 6-58.)

The No Project Alternative would result in similar or greater impacts to the proposed General Plan. Impacts to transportation and circulation, long-term regional air quality emissions, and long-term vehicular noise would be greater under this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-58.)

Impacts under the remaining four alternatives would be similar to the proposed General Plan for cultural resources, geology and soils, flood and dam inundation hazards, and hazardous materials. (DEIR, p. 6-58.)

The Rural Emphasis Alternative and Less Intense Community Centers Alternative would both result in less concentrated development throughout the County. Thus, under each of these alternatives, impacts to land use and agriculture, long-term vehicular noise, and long-term

regional air quality emissions would be greater than under the proposed General Plan. Transportation/circulation impacts associated with the Rural Emphasis Alternative would be similar to those anticipated for the proposed General Plan. The Rural Emphasis Alternative would reduce the amount of population growth that could be accommodated within the County. Thus, impacts to aesthetics, light and glare, air quality, construction and long-term vehicular noise, and solid waste would be reduced, with the exception of greater aesthetic impact relating to the conversion of open space to urban land use. However, impacts to housing and population, mineral resources, water resources, and public services (except solid waste) would be greater under this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-58.)

Transportation and Circulation impacts associated with the Less Intense Community Centers Alternative would be greater than those anticipated for the proposed General Plan. The Less Intense Community Centers Alternative would accommodate the same level of population increase as the proposed General Plan. Thus, impacts to housing and population, aesthetics, light and glare, construction noise, construction air quality, energy, and public services (except wastewater) would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan. Impacts to wastewater would be greater under the Less Intense Community Centers Alternative, as more infrastructure would be required to service less concentrated areas. (DEIR, p. 6-58.)

The More Intense Community Centers and Density Bonus Alternatives would both result in increased concentration of development. Thus, under each of these alternatives, impacts to traffic and circulation, long-term regional air quality emissions, long-term vehicular noise, and biological resources would be reduced. Aesthetic impacts relating to the conversion of open space to urban land uses would also be reduced. Impacts relating to housing and population, mineral resources, construction and stationary noise, aesthetics, light and glare, and public services (except solid waste and wastewater) would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan. Impacts relating to land use would increase, as more people would be concentrated in areas exposed to noise and other hazards. (DEIR, p. 6-59.)

The More Intense Community Centers Alternative allows the same level of development as the proposed General Plan. Thus, impacts to parks and recreation, solid waste, wastewater, and water resources would be similar. The Density Bonus Alternative would allow an overall increase in population in unincorporated Riverside County that could be accommodated. Thus, impacts to parks and recreation, solid waste, wastewater, and water resources would be greater than under the Density Bonus Alternative than the proposed General Plan. (DEIR, p. 6-59.)

Overall, the More Intense Community Centers Alternative would result in similar or reduced impacts when compared with the proposed General Plan (with the exception of land use impacts). All other feasible alternatives would result in greater impacts than the proposed General Plan. Thus, the More Intense Community Centers Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The More Intense Community Centers Alternative would also meet the objectives of the proposed General Plan. (DEIR, p. 6-59.)

A. NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE

Description

With this alternative, the proposed General Plan would not be adopted, and no further building would occur within the unincorporated portions of Riverside County. This prohibition would compel any subsequent development to occur in the incorporated cities of the County, resulting in any incremental growth in population, housing, or employment opportunities to occur in these incorporated cities. The No Build alternative represents a baseline against which the impacts of the proposed General Plan can be measured. (DEIR, p. 6-3.)

Relationships and Assumptions

1. Relationship to the Western County MSHCP

No Western Riverside County MSHCP is assumed in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-4.)

2. Relationship to the Coachella Valley Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan

This plan is not assumed to occur in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-4.)

3. Assumptions Regarding CETAP Corridors

No CETAP corridors are assumed in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-4.)

4. Assumed Circulation System

The existing County and Cities General Plan circulation is assumed. However, because no development is assumed in this alternative within unincorporated areas, no future roadway improvements within unincorporated areas are assumed to occur. (DEIR, p. 6-4.)

5. Development within Cities and their spheres of influence

This alternative assumes that the Cities within Riverside County continue to build out according to their General Plans. Annexations of cities' spheres of influence are not assumed, and no development is assumed to occur within cities' spheres of influence. (DEIR, p. 6-4.)

Summary of Environmental Impacts and Conclusions About the No Build Alternative

Because the No Build Alternative would prohibit the construction or expansion of structures and facilities throughout unincorporated areas of the County, alterations to the topography, natural habitats, agricultural lands, or the existing visual characteristic of unincorporated Riverside County would not occur. The extent and distribution of land uses would remain as it currently

exists; therefore, potential land use compatibility impacts would be no greater than those which currently exist. This alternative would prevent future development in potential hazard areas (e.g., geologic and flood hazard areas) and would limit the expanded siting of uses utilizing hazardous materials within unincorporated areas of the County. Because no increase in the amount or extent of development would occur, as compared to the Proposed General Plan, the No Build Alternative would reduce impacts related to biological resources, agricultural lands, and the visual character of the County would be reduced. A prohibition on future development would reduce future air pollutant emissions and noise generating sources, reducing impacts associated with these issues from what would occur with implementation of the proposed General Plan.

Because no new mining operations would be permitted, the No Build Alternative would limit the availability of mineral resources that may be recovered at new mining sites. Since development would not be permitted in unincorporated areas of the County, residents and workers may be forced to travel further for employment and commercial service. Improvements in the County's jobs-to-housing balance that would occur with the proposed General Plan would not occur if the No Build Alternative was implemented. Development within cities would have the potential to significantly disrupt the hydrologic processes in unincorporated areas of the County. No improvements to County, public, or private facilities, including roadways, flood control features, public safety and service facilities, or utility systems would be permitted.

Under the No Build Alternative, any future development and accompanying growth would be restricted to incorporated cities. The increased population of these cities will continue to utilize County roadways, withdraw water from the same groundwater basins, and recreate on County lands. Because the construction or expansion of facilities is not allowed, existing facilities may not be sufficiently sized to accommodate increased usage.

While the No Build Alternative would certainly reduce the significant impacts associated with a number of environmental issues, implementation of this alternative would force unincorporated areas of the County to bear, without the possibility of implementing remedies, a number of impacts associated with future growth occurring in incorporated areas.

(DEIR, p. 6-4 through 6-13.)

B. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Description

The CEQA Guidelines require a "no project alternative" to "discuss the existing conditions [on a piece of property], as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.2, subd. (e)(2).) Inevitably, in predicting what might happen under a "no project" scenario, a public agency must engage in some degree of speculation regarding how a particular landowner might attempt to ultimately take advantage of its current General Plan and zoning designations.

The “no project alternative” assumes that the proposed General Plan would not be adopted by Riverside County, and the existing General Plan, Specific Plans, and Community Plans would remain in place. (DEIR, p. 6-13.)

Relationships and Assumptions

1. Relationship to the Western Riverside County MSHCP

No Western Riverside County MSHCP is assumed in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-13.)

2. Relationship to the Coachella Valley Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan

This plan is not assumed to occur in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-13.)

3. Assumptions Regarding CETAP Corridors

No CETAP corridors are assumed in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-13.)

4. Assumed Circulation System

Build out of the existing General Plan circulation map is assumed. (DEIR, p. 6-13.)

5. Development within Cities and their spheres of influence

This alternative assumes that Cities would build out according to their General Plans. No annexations of Cities’ spheres of influence are assumed. As a result, spheres of influence would be built out based on the existing County General Plan. (DEIR, p. 6-13.)

Summary of Environmental Impacts/Conclusion of the No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative assumes that development would occur as established in the existing General Plan, Specific Plans, and Community Plans. Housing, population, and job increases would occur as planned in the existing General Plan, in proportions which, unlike the proposed General Plan, would have the potential to exacerbate the jobs-to-housing imbalance in Riverside County. Potential impacts related to light and glare would be similar to those associated with the proposed General Plan. ‘

Air emissions impacts under the No Project Alternative for both short-term construction emissions and long term regional emissions are assumed to be likely to exceed the emissions thresholds established by the Air Quality Management Districts, resulting in significant impacts. The severity of the short-term construction emissions impact is anticipated to be similar to the proposed General Plan; the severity of the long-term regional emissions impact is anticipated to

be greater under this alternative than under the proposed General Plan since the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) under the No Project Alternative will be greater than generated by the proposed General Plan.

Since development under the No Project Alternative would continue as outlined in the existing General Plan, impacts to cultural resources, energy, flood hazards, geology and soils, hazardous materials, and mineral resources are anticipated to be similar to those associated with the existing General Plan. Short-term construction noise impacts would be similar under this alternative as under the proposed General Plan. However, as construction contractors for each project would have to comply with the County's noise control ordinance requirements, no significant construction noise impacts would occur. Long-term vehicular traffic noise impacts would be greater under the No Project Alternative than under the proposed General Plan due to the greater number of VMTs. Long-term stationary sources and long-term railroad noise impacts would not occur under the No Project Alternative, as all new development would be required to comply with existing noise standards.

The No Project Alternative would allow the build out of the existing County General Plan, which includes parks and recreation facilities and increased public services. Impacts to parks and recreation and to public services would be identical to those under the existing General Plan. Impacts to surface water and groundwater resources as well as hydrologic features and water quality under the No Project Alternative would also be identical to those under the existing General Plan.

The No Project Alternative would not result in any appreciable reduction in impacts compared to the proposed General Plan. In addition, it would result in increased impacts relating to the jobs and housing balance, long-term regional air emissions, long-term vehicular noise, and transportation compared to the proposed General Plan.

(DEIR, p. 6-14 through 6-21.)

C. RURAL EMPHASIS ALTERNATIVE

Description

This alternative assumes that the County would adopt a General Plan that would, to the extent feasible, eliminate future urban development within unincorporated areas. Except for existing approved Specific Plans, tract maps, and commercial/industrial site plans, unincorporated areas would be planned for and built out with rural residential (1 dwelling unit per 5-20 acres), agriculture, and open space uses. (DEIR, p. 6-21.)

Relationships and Assumptions

1. Relationship to the Western Riverside County MSHCP

Adoption of a smaller MSHCP, providing only for the conservation of protected species, is assumed under this alternative. As a consequence, the redistribution of development from conservation areas would change the location of development, but not result in an overall increase in residential build out within western Riverside County. (DEIR, p. 6-21.)

2. Relationship to the Coachella Valley Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan

This plan is not assumed to occur in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-21.)

3. Assumptions Regarding CETAP Corridors

No CETAP corridors are assumed in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-21.)

4. Assumed Circulation System

With the exception of roadways that would be inconsistent with the Western Riverside County MSHCP, build out of the existing General Plan circulation map is assumed. (DEIR, p. 6-21.)

5. Development within Cities and their spheres of influence

Because urban development would be directed toward cities under this alternative, annexation of each city's sphere of influence is assumed. This alternative assumes that Cities would build out according to the existing General Plan of each city. (DEIR, p. 6-21.)

Summary of Environmental Impacts/Conclusion of the Rural Emphasis Alternative

The Rural Emphasis Alternative assumes that no additional development would occur within the County with the exception of rural, open space, and agricultural uses. Housing, population, and job increases would not occur as planned in the proposed General Plan due to the shortage in housing, resulting in the need for incorporated cities to provide more than their "fair share" of jobs and housing for the region. This alternative, unlike the proposed General Plan, would have the potential to exacerbate the jobs to housing imbalance in Riverside County. Potential impacts related to aesthetic/visual resources and light and glare would be less than those associated with the proposed General Plan.

Air emissions impacts under the Rural Emphasis Alternative for both short-term construction emissions and long term regional emissions are assumed to be likely to exceed the emissions thresholds established by Air Quality Management District, resulting in significant impacts. The severity of the short-term construction emissions impact and the long-term regional emissions impact is anticipated to be less than the proposed General Plan.

Development under the Rural Emphasis Alternative would not continue as outlined in the proposed General Plan; however, impacts to cultural resources, energy, flood hazards, geology and soils, and hazardous materials are anticipated to be similar to those associated with the proposed General Plan as lands would be impacted by rural and agricultural development. Impacts to mineral resources would be greater, as no additional mineral extraction would be permitted. Short-term construction noise impacts would be less under this alternative than under the proposed General Plan. However, as construction contractors for each project would have to comply with the County's noise control ordinance requirements, no significant construction noise impacts would occur. Long-term vehicular traffic noise impacts would be less under the Rural Emphasis Alternative than those under the proposed General Plan. Significant long-term stationary sources and long-term railroad noise impacts would not occur under the Rural Emphasis Alternative, as all new development would be required to comply with existing noise standards.

The Rural Emphasis Alternative would not allow the build out of the proposed County General Plan, which includes parks and recreation facilities and increased public services. However, using the land for rural, agricultural, and open space would reduce the demand for parks and recreation facilities and public services and would potentially provide additional areas for recreational use. Impacts to surface water and groundwater resources as well as hydrologic features under the Rural Emphasis Alternative would also be similar to those under the proposed General Plan, as increased development would occur within the cities that would rely on the same water resources as the County. However, impacts to water quality may be greater than those under the proposed General Plan, as pollution from fertilizers and pesticides could increase.

Transportation and circulation impacts associated with this alternative would likely be similar to the proposed General Plan. The existing General Plan circulation system would accommodate future traffic volume increases from implementation of this alternative comparable to the ability of the circulation system in the proposed General Plan to accommodate its estimated traffic volume increases.

Because the population and development levels would decrease under the Rural Emphasis Alternative, it would result in reduction in impacts to aesthetic/visual resources, air quality, energy, and solid waste impacts compared to the proposed General Plan. However, as development and population would be less concentrated, it would result in increased impacts to fire, sheriff, schools, libraries, medical facilities, wastewater, and water resources compared to the proposed General Plan. Increased impacts relating to the jobs and housing balance, and water quality would occur under this alternative as a result of replacing potential high-density housing with potentially ground-water-polluting agricultural uses.

(DEIR, pp. 6-21 through 6-30.)

D. LESS INTENSE COMMUNITY CENTERS ALTERNATIVE

Description

This alternative assumes that the County would adopt a General Plan that would reduce the scale, intensity, and the number of community centers. Rather than reducing the overall buildout of unincorporated areas, this alternative would represent (as compared to the proposed General Plan) a less concentrated pattern of development intensity. Development intensity within the Western Riverside County MSHCP reserve areas would be distributed evenly throughout western Riverside County. The location of development would be changed, but there would not be an overall increase in residential buildout within Riverside County. (DEIR, p. 6-31.)

Consistency With Other Plans

1. Relationship to the Western Riverside County MSHCP

Adoption and implementation of the proposed Western Riverside County MSHCP is assumed under this alternative. Development intensity that is shown on General Plan and Area Plan land use maps within the Western Riverside County MSHCP reserve areas would be distributed evenly throughout western Riverside County. As a consequence, the redistribution of development from conservation areas would change the location of development, but would not result in an overall increase in residential build out within western Riverside County. (DEIR, p. 6-31.)

2. Relationship to the Coachella Valley Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan

This plan is not assumed to occur in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-31.)

3. Assumptions Regarding CETAP Corridors

Two north-south and two east-west CETAP corridors are assumed in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-31.)

4. Assumed Circulation System

An enhanced arterial system that would maximize roadway capacity is assumed. Roadways that are inconsistent with implementation of the Western Riverside County MSHCP would not be included in the proposed circulation system. (DEIR, p. 6-31.)

5. Development within Cities and their spheres of influence

No annexation of cities' spheres of influence is assumed. Under this alternative, cities would build out according to their respective General Plans. Spheres of influence would be built out based on the Less Intense Community centers alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-31.)

Summary of Environmental Impacts/Conclusion of the Less Intense Community Centers Alternative

The Less Intense Community Centers Alternative assumes that development would occur largely as established in the proposed General Plan, except for a reduction in the number and intensity of community centers. Housing, population, and job increases would occur as planned in the proposed General Plan. Potential impacts related to aesthetics, light and glare would be similar to those associated with the proposed General Plan, with the exception of increased conversion of open space to urban land use.

Air emissions impacts under the Less Intense Community Centers Alternative for both short-term construction emissions and long term regional emissions are assumed to be likely to exceed the emissions thresholds established by the Air Quality Management District, resulting in significant impacts. The severity of the short-term construction emissions impact is anticipated to be similar to the proposed General Plan; the severity of the long-term regional emissions impact is anticipated to be similar under this alternative to the proposed General Plan.

Since development under the Less Intense Community Centers Alternative would continue primarily as outlined in the proposed General Plan, impacts to cultural resources, energy, flood hazards, geology and soils, hazardous materials, and mineral resources are anticipated to be similar to those associated with the proposed General Plan. Impacts to traffic would be greater under the Less Intense Community Centers Alternative, because development would be less concentrated, resulting in an increased travel distance from residences to jobs and commercial areas.

Short-term construction noise impacts would be similar under this alternative as under the proposed General Plan. However, as construction contractors for each project would have to comply with the County's noise control ordinance requirements, no significant construction noise impacts would occur. Long-term vehicular traffic noise impacts would potentially be greater under the Less Intense Community Centers Alternative to those under the proposed General Plan due to increased traffic. Significant long-term stationary sources and long-term railroad noise impacts would not occur under the Less Intense Community Centers Alternative, as all new development would be required to comply with existing noise standards.

The Less Intense Community Centers Alternative would allow the level of build out of the proposed General Plan, which includes parks and recreation facilities and increased public services. Impacts to parks and recreation and to public services would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan. Impacts to surface water and groundwater resources as well as hydrologic features and water quality under the Less Intense Community Centers Alternative would also be similar to those under the proposed General Plan.

The Less Intense Community Centers Alternative would not result in any appreciable reduction in impacts compared to the proposed General Plan. In addition, because development would be less concentrated (resulting in more VMTs) it would result in increased impacts relating to long-

term regional air emissions, long-term vehicular noise, and transportation compared to the proposed General Plan.

(DEIR, pp. 6-31 through 6-39.)

E. MORE INTENSE COMMUNITY CENTERS ALTERNATIVE

Description

While the number of community centers would be reduced, under this alternative, the scale and intensity of community centers would be increased. Rather than increasing the overall build out of unincorporated areas, this alternative would represent (as compared to the proposed General Plan) a more concentrated pattern of development intensity however the number of community centers would be reduced. Development intensity within the Western Riverside County MSHCP reserve areas would be redistributed into community centers throughout western Riverside County. While the location of development would be changed, there would not be an overall increase in residential build out within western Riverside County. (DEIR, p. 6-39.)

Relationships and Assumptions

1. Relationship to the Western County MSHCP

Adoption and implementation of the proposed Western Riverside County MSHCP is assumed under this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-39.)

2. Relationship to the Coachella Valley Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan

This plan is not assumed to occur in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-39.)

3. Assumptions Regarding CETAP Corridors

Two north-south and two east-west CETAP corridors are assumed in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-39.)

4. Assumed Circulation System

An enhanced arterial system that would maximize roadway capacity is assumed. Roadways that are inconsistent with implementation of the Western Riverside County MSHCP would not be included in the proposed circulation system. (DEIR, p. 6-39.)

5. Development within Cities and their spheres of influence

No annexation of cities' spheres of influence is assumed. Under this alternative, cities would build out according to their respective General Plans. Spheres of influence would be built out based on the More Intense Community Centers Alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-39.)

Summary of Environmental Impacts/Conclusion of the More Intense Community Centers Alternative

The More Intense Community Centers Alternative assumes that development would occur as largely as established in the proposed General Plan, except for a reduction in the number and an increase in the intensity of community centers. Housing, population, and job increases would occur as planned in the proposed General Plan. Potential impacts related to aesthetics, light and glare would be similar to those associated with the proposed General Plan, although significant impacts resulting from open space to urban land use conversion would be reduced under this alternative.

Air emissions impacts under the More Intense Community Centers Alternative for both short-term construction emissions and long term regional emissions are assumed to be likely to exceed the emissions thresholds established by Air Quality Management Districts resulting in significant impacts. The severity of the short-term construction emissions impact is anticipated to be similar to the proposed General Plan; the severity of the long-term regional emissions impact is anticipated to be similar under this alternative to the proposed General Plan.

Since development under the More Intense Community Centers Alternative would continue primarily as outlined in the proposed General Plan, impacts to cultural resources, energy, biology, flood hazards, geology and soils, hazardous materials, and mineral resources are anticipated to be similar to those associated with the proposed General Plan. Short-term construction noise impacts would be similar under this alternative as under the proposed General Plan. However, as construction contractors for each project would have to comply with the County's noise control ordinance requirements, no significant construction noise impacts would occur. Long-term vehicular traffic noise impacts would be similar under the More Intense Community Centers Alternative to those under the proposed General Plan. Significant long-term stationary sources and long-term railroad noise impacts would not occur under the More Intense Community Centers Alternative, as all new development would be required to comply with existing noise standards.

The More Intense Community Centers Alternative would allow the level of build out of the proposed General Plan, which includes parks and recreation facilities and increased public services. Impacts to parks and recreation and to public services would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan. Impacts to surface water and groundwater resources as well as hydrologic features and water quality under the More Intense Community Centers Alternative would also be similar to those under the proposed General Plan.

The More Intense Community Centers Alternative would reduce energy, long-term vehicular noise, and transportation/circulation impacts compared to the proposed General Plan. Because this alternative would result in a decreased level of conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses, it would result in decreased impacts relating to land use and agriculture compared to the proposed General Plan.

(DEIR, pp. 6-40 through 6-47.)

F. DENSITY BONUS ALTERNATIVE

Description

Under this alternative, an incentive system would provide density bonuses to proposed residential development meeting specified criteria. A 100 percent density bonus for residential development would be allowed in the community centers and up to 50 percent density bonus allowed in the community development areas. Therefore, this alternative would contain a net increase in residential development within unincorporated areas. (DEIR, p. 6-47.)

This alternative assumes that the County would adopt a General Plan that would increase the intensity of community centers without increasing commercial and industrial development. Rather than increasing the overall build out of unincorporated areas, this alternative would represent (as compared to the proposed General Plan) a more concentrated pattern of development intensity while allowing for an increase in open space. Development intensity within the Western Riverside County MSHCP reserve areas would be distributed evenly throughout western Riverside County. The location of development would be changed with an overall increase in residential build out within Riverside County. (DEIR, p. 6-48.)

Relationships and Assumptions

1. Relationship to the Western Riverside County MSHCP

Adoption and implementation of the proposed Western Riverside County MSHCP is assumed under this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-48.)

2. Relationship to the Coachella Valley Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan

This plan is not assumed to occur in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-48.)

3. Assumptions Regarding CETAP Corridors

Two north-south and two east-west CETAP corridors are assumed in this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-48.)

4. Assumed Circulation System

An enhanced arterial system that would maximize roadway capacity is assumed. Roadways that are inconsistent with implementation of the Western Riverside County MSHCP would not be included in the proposed circulation system. (DEIR, p. 6-48.)

5. Development within Cities and their spheres of influence

No annexation of cities' spheres of influence is assumed. Under this alternative, cities would build out according to their respective General Plans. (DEIR, p. 6-48.)

Summary of Environmental Impacts/Conclusion of the Density Bonus Alternative

The Density Bonus Alternative assumes that development would occur as largely as established in the proposed General Plan, except for an allowed density bonus which would increase the intensity of community centers. Housing and population increases would occur at a higher rate than under the proposed General Plan, and job increases would occur at the same level as under the proposed General Plan. Potential impacts related to aesthetics, light and glare would be greater to those associated with the proposed General Plan.

Air emissions impacts under the Density Bonus Alternative for both short-term construction emissions and long term regional emissions are assumed to be likely to exceed the emissions thresholds established by the Air Quality Management Districts, resulting in significant impacts. The severity of the short-term construction emissions and long-term regional emissions impacts are anticipated to be similar to the proposed General Plan.

Since development under the Density Bonus Alternative would continue primarily as outlined in the proposed General Plan (though with greater density in community centers), impacts to cultural resources, energy, flood hazards, geology and soils, hazardous materials, and mineral resources are anticipated to be similar to those associated with the proposed General Plan. Short-term construction noise impacts would be similar under this alternative as under the proposed General Plan. However, as construction contractors for each project would have to comply with the County's noise control ordinance requirements, no significant construction noise impacts would occur. Because this alternative would increase the concentration of development, transportation/circulation impacts would be decreased. Thus, long-term vehicular traffic noise impacts would be less under the Density Bonus Alternative compared to those under the proposed General Plan. Significant long-term stationary sources and long-term railroad noise impacts would not occur under the Density Bonus Alternative, as all new development would be required to comply with existing noise standards.

The Density Bonus Alternative would allow the level of build out of the proposed General Plan, which includes parks and recreation facilities and increased public services. Impacts to parks and recreation and to public services would be greater than those under the proposed General Plan because of the increase in population. Impacts to surface water and groundwater resources as well as hydrologic features and water quality under the Density Bonus Alternative would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan. Impacts to water resources would increase, as increased population would result in a greater demand for water.

The Density Bonus Alternative would reduce impacts to biological resources because it would allow the conservation of open space by concentrating development, and would also reduce long-term traffic and vehicular noise impacts compared to the proposed General Plan. Because the density allowed in housing areas would increase, the alternative would result in increased impacts relating to land use, aesthetics and visual resources, energy, parks and recreation, solid waste, wastewater, and water resources compared to the proposed General Plan.

(DEIR, pp. 6-48 through 6-56.)

XV. RECIRCULATION OF DRAFT EIR

The County has received several requests that the County recirculate the General Plan Draft EIR for another round of public review. The Board finds that recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required. The following findings set forth the Board's findings in this regard.

1. Standard For Recirculation

Pursuant to section 15088.5 of the Guidelines to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), recirculation of an EIR is required when "significant new information" is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review but prior to certification of the Final EIR. The term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement.

"Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
- (4) The Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR. The above standard is "not intend[ed] to promote endless rounds of revision and recirculation of EIR's." (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California* (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1112, 1132.) "Recirculation was intended to be an exception, rather than the general rule." (*Ibid.*)

2. Findings regarding Recirculation

- A. Land Use

1a. Issue (Land Use Compatibility)

The revised General Plan features revisions to certain land use designations and their attendant building density allowances. For instance, the revised General Plan now includes a designation for Rural Community, which encompasses Estate Density Residential (2 acre minimum lot size), Very Low Density Residential (1 acre minimum lot size), and Low Density Residential (one-half acre minimum lot size). The Community Development GP Foundation Component now includes designations for Estate Density Residential (2 acre minimum lot size) and Highest Density Residential (20+ dwelling units per acre). Also, building intensity ranges for residential uses within the Community Development Foundation Component have been adjusted such that building intensity has decreased within each preexisting category from Very Low Density Residential (now 1 acre minimum lot size) to Very High Density Residential (now allows 14-20 dwelling units per acre). (See revised Table LU-3.)

2a. Finding

This change in the project does not require recirculation of the Draft EIR. Although the information in DEIR Table 3.C is not complete given the new land use designations described above, the proposed changes will not result in any new significant land use impacts, nor will they substantially increase the severity of any previously identified significant impacts.

The Rural Community classification identifies communities and neighborhoods having a rural lifestyle, where animal uses and limited infrastructure are prevalent. These communities often define their rural lifestyle in part through a desire to maintain large residential lot sizes. As such, the creation or identification of any Rural Community areas will not result in significant population increases. The Rural Community designation has been added to the Countywide land use map in limited fashion. In light of the substantial geographic area studied, the effect of this project change will be dispersed. The addition of Rural Community areas will not add significant numbers of residents to the Plan area or result in a significant loss of open space.

The revised density limitations for residential uses under the Community Development Foundation Component will have a negligible effect with respect to land use compatibility issues. If anything, the revised building intensity restrictions will have a beneficial environmental effect because development under any of the residential use categories will be less dense than analyzed in the EIR. For example, development under the “Very Low Density Residential” designation previously allowed single-family detached residences on ½-acre lots. Following the revision, development of a residence under the VLDR category may not occur on less than one acre. On the other end of the scale, development under the “Very High Density Residential” designation previously allowed 20-40 dwelling units per acre. Following the revision, development under the VHDR category must adhere to a range of 14-20 dwelling units per acre. Thus, the EIR generally overstates building intensity.¹ The adjustment to building intensity ranges will not generate any new significant land use compatibility impacts.

¹ / The DEIR estimates a range of dwelling units for each residential land use designation based, in part, on the “dwelling unit per acre factors” listed in Table 3.D. Following the revisions to the General Plan, these “du/acre

The DEIR concluded that land use compatibility impacts resulting from the project could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. The General Plan includes self-mitigating land use policies that reduce conflicts between distinct adjacent land uses. (See DEIR, pp. 4.2-14 to 4.2-16.) These policies ensure that future development follows a consistent and orderly pattern. They will provide for the implementation of measures to buffer adjacent land uses from potentially adverse impacts of neighboring uses. These policies apply equally to the revised land use categories and their attendant building intensity ranges. As such, to the extent the project changes cause any land use compatibility issues, those impacts are mitigable.

1b. Issue (Conversion of Agricultural Lands)

As discussed above, revisions to the General Plan would create new land use designations and alter somewhat the locations of particular land uses as reflected in DEIR Figure 3-2, as well as certain of the Area Plans. The changes in the Plan could result in additional loss of “prime” farmland, “farmland of statewide importance,” and “unique” farmland.

2b. Finding

This change in the project does not require recirculation of the EIR. The DEIR has determined that the conversion of agricultural land caused by the Project will be significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, p. 4.2-20.) Changes in the General Plan will not render this impact substantially more severe. Encroachments upon agricultural land due to the Plan changes are limited. Throughout the entire County, the DEIR concluded that the Project would result in a loss of 62,084 acres of agricultural land. (DEIR, pp. 4.2-12 and 4.2-17.) Revisions in General Plan land use designations would not substantially increase this loss. To the extent the changes in the Plan will result in the conversion of designated farmland, the Plan contains self-mitigating policies to reduce or minimize the effect of future development on existing agricultural resources. (DEIR, pp. 4.2-17 to 4.2-19.)

1c. Issue (Land Use Policy 16.1)

The language of Land Use Policy 16.1 has been revised. The current version directs the County to “Retain agriculturally designated lands where agricultural activity can be sustained at an operational scale. . .” (GP, p. LU-38.) The revised version would “*encourage*” the County to retain agriculturally designated lands, etc.

2c. Finding

This change in the Project does not require recirculation. The DEIR has determined that the conversion of agricultural land caused by the Project will be significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, p. 4.2-20.) The revision to LU Policy 16.1 will not render this impact substantially more severe. Despite the revised language, the policy will still have the effect of reducing impacts to

factors” yield a conservative analysis of land use impacts, as they tend to exaggerate the number of units that will actually occur under the Community Development Residential classifications.

designated farmland. The DEIR acknowledges, “[t]he proposed General Plan includes policies that will encourage the conservation of productive agricultural land; require consideration of State agricultural designation when amending General Plan Foundation Components; and support and participate in agriculture education programs. However, these policies do not set specific requirements that will limit the conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses.” (DEIR, p. 4.2-20.) Thus, the revision to Land Use Policy 16.1 is consistent with the analysis in the EIR.

B. Traffic and Circulation

1a. Issue (Level Of Service Increases)

As discussed above, changes to the General Plan would create new land use designations and alter somewhat the locations of particular land uses as reflected in DEIR Figure 3-2, as well as certain of the Area Plans. Revisions in the Plan would also adjust building density ranges for residential uses under the Community Development Foundation Component. These changes could affect traffic levels and circulations patterns.

2a. Finding

This change in the Project does not require recirculation of the EIR. The EIR concludes that significant and unavoidable impacts will occur on the County’s arterial transportation and circulation system at the locations shown in red on Figures 4.16.10 and 4.16.12. Significant and unavoidable impacts will also occur on the freeway locations shown in red on Figures 4.16.10 and 4.16.12. Changes in the Project will not render these impacts substantially more severe. Nor will Project revisions generate new significant traffic impacts.

Land use changes are limited and do not significantly alter the location and distribution of land uses studied in the EIR. Accordingly, traffic levels of service and circulation patterns are not expected to diverge significantly from those predicted in the EIR.

The Rural Community Designations do not call for intensified or dense development and do not result in significant population increases. Moreover, the Rural Community Designation has been applied in the revised Plan only to a limited extent. In light of the vast geographic scope of the project, traffic increases resulting from this change will be dispersed. The addition of this land use classification is not expected to cause substantial increases in traffic levels of service.

Building intensity ranges for residential uses within the Community Development Foundation Component have been adjusted downward to allow fewer dwelling units per acre. (See “Exhibit 1,” p. 17.) This revision would tend to reduce the number of people living in a particular area and would reduce the attendant number of automobile trips on local collectors, arterials, and regional highways and freeways.

1b. Issue (Highway 79 Policy Area – GP Policy C 2.6)

The proposed “Highway 79 Policy Area” would condition new development on a showing that adequate transportation infrastructure capacity exists to support the new development. A program would be established to ensure that overall trip generation does not exceed system capacity or applicable Level of Service standards. The policy establishes a goal of reducing Policy Area traffic generation by 9% from trips projected in the General Plan.

2b. Finding

This change in the Project does not require recirculation of the EIR. The EIR concluded that the Project would result in significant transportation impacts along State Route 79, particularly between San Jacinto and Beaumont. (See DEIR, Figure 4.16.10.) General Plan Policy C 2.6 would help to mitigate those impacts. Policy C 2.6 would also help to reduce transportation impacts along Highway 79 between Temecula and San Jacinto. Recirculation is required where new information reveals a feasible mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, *but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it*. Here, the County is proposing to implement a measure that would reduce traffic impacts resulting from new development. Any non-transportation impacts resulting from construction of transportation infrastructure within the Highway 79 Policy Area would be mitigated by General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified in the EIR.

C. General Plan Certainty System

1a. Issue (Agriculture Foundation Amendment Cycle)

The revised General Plan would include a fourth amendment category for Agriculture Foundation Amendments. Ordinarily, general plan amendments proposing a change of land use designation from one Foundation Component to another will only be entertained by the County at five-year intervals. (See General Plan, p. I-7.) The Plan revisions would allow the County to consider proposals to amend the Agriculture Foundation land use designation to some other use designation every 2½ years. (See Exhibit I, p. 49.) Generally, the Agriculture Foundation Amendment Cycle would allow no more than 7% of all land designated as agriculture to change to other Foundation and land use designations during each 2½-year cycle.

2a. Finding

This change in the Project does not require recirculation of the EIR. Although the revision would allow the Board to consider amendments to the Agriculture land use designation with increased frequency, it would be pure speculation at this time to predict (1) how many proposals for Agriculture Foundation General Plan Amendments would be submitted over the course of the Plan period, (2) the scope of such proposals (in terms of total acreage), and (3) whether the Board would even approve such proposals. A lead agency is not required to speculate about future impacts that might result from future, unspecified projects. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15064, subs. (d)(3) & (f)(5).) The EIR concludes that impacts resulting from

conversion of agricultural lands will be significant and unavoidable. The EIR estimates that the Project will cause the loss of 62,084 acres of designated farmland. The change in the Agriculture Amendment Foundation Cycle is not expected to affect this determination.

D. Area Plans

1a. Issue

As discussed above, changes to the General Plan would create new land use designations and alter somewhat the locations of particular land uses as reflected in DEIR Figure 3-2, as well as certain of the Area Plans. Revisions in the Plan would also adjust building density ranges for residential uses under the Community Development Foundation Component. These revisions to the General Plan could alter statistical information relating to population, housing, and employment for each of the Area Plans.

1b. Finding

This change in the Project does not require recirculation of the EIR.

The revised General Plan proposes limited land use changes that do not significantly alter the location and distribution of the land uses studied in the EIR. Accordingly, population, housing and employment projections are not expected to deviate significantly from those reflected in the EIR.

The Rural Community Designations do not call for intensified or dense development and will not result in significant population increases. Moreover, the Rural Community Designation has been applied in the revised Plan only to a limited extent.

Building intensity ranges for residential uses within the Community Development Foundation Component have been adjusted downward to allow fewer dwelling units per acre. (See "Exhibit 1," p. 17.) This revision would tend to reduce the number of people living in a particular area and would reduce the attendant housing and employment needs. In light of the changes to residential building intensity allowances, the EIR now tends to overstate the impacts of the Project. The result is a more conservative evaluation of the Project's potential impacts.

1b. Issue (Diamond Valley Lake Policy Area)

The revised General Plan would include Policy Area within the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan for Diamond Valley Lake, an existing 800,000 acre-foot capacity reservoir owned and operated by MWD. Under this policy, the County would cooperate with MWD and the City of Hemet to encourage development of the lake's recreational opportunities and supporting commercial services. Certain lands surrounding the lake are currently designated for "open space-recreation." The revised General Plan envisions that Diamond Valley Lake's recreational and tourist-oriented facilities will be developed pursuant to one or more specific plans contained within the policy area.

2b. Finding

This change in the Project does not require recirculation of the EIR. Although the Plan expresses a desire to harness the recreational potential of the lake, the nature, character and extent of future development at Diamond Valley Lake is currently unknown. Many factors will determine the scope of development, if any, within the policy area, including the involvement of private actors and the cooperation of MWD and the City of Hemet. It is expected that tourist-oriented development would be less intense than ordinary residential, commercial or industrial development. The EIR evaluates the impact of recreation-oriented land use within the policy area. Additional development would not substantially or dramatically deviate from this type of use. Therefore, the addition of the policy area to the General Plan will not result in any new significant environmental impacts. Any future development proposals for the policy area will be subject to environmental review of the required specific plan.

E. Water Supply

1a. Issue

As discussed above, changes to the General Plan would create new land use designations and alter somewhat the locations of particular land uses as reflected in DEIR Figure 3-2, as well as certain of the Area Plans. Revisions in the Plan would also adjust building density ranges for residential uses under the Community Development Foundation Component. These changes could affect water supply demands.

1b. Finding

This change in the Project does not require recirculation of the EIR. The EIR states that population increases projected for Riverside County will increase the demand for water beyond currently available supplies. (DEIR, p. 4.17-12.) The EIR concludes the Project will result in significant and unavoidable water supply impacts. (DEIR, p. 4.17-25.) Changes in the Project will not render this impact substantially more severe. Nor will Project revisions generate new significant water supply impacts.

The revised General Plan proposes limited land use changes that do not significantly alter the location and distribution of the land uses studied in the EIR. Accordingly, water supply demands are not expected to deviate significantly from those predicted in the EIR.

The Rural Community Designations do not call for intensified or dense development and will not result in significant population increases. Moreover, the Rural Community Designation has been applied in the revised Plan only to a limited extent. The addition of this land use classification is not expected to cause substantial increases in water supply demands.

Building intensity ranges for residential uses within the Community Development Foundation Component have been adjusted downward to allow fewer dwelling units per acre.

(See “Exhibit 1,” p. 17.) This revision would tend to reduce the number of people living in a particular area and would reduce the attendant demands for water. In light of the changes to residential building intensity allowances, the EIR now tends to overstate the impacts of the Project, including water supply impacts. Although the effect remains significant and unavoidable, the EIR now provides a more conservative evaluation of water supply impacts.

F. Miscellaneous General Plan Policies

1a. Issue (deletion/modification of certain Plan Policies)

The following General Plan policies have been deleted: LU 1.3. The following General Plan policies have been modified or revised: AQ 1.10, AQ 4.3, AQ 4.5, AQ 4.7, AQ 10.2, AQ 12.1, AQ 12.4, AQ13.1, AQ 14.2, C 15.1, C 15.2, C 16.5, C 17.2, C 18.1, C 18.2, S 5.8, and S5.9. Circulation policies C 14.1 through C 14.5 would be deleted and replaced with three revised policies.

1b. Finding

These changes in the General Plan do not require recirculation of the EIR. Revisions to plan policies are limited in number and in effect. Most of the revised policies retain a self-mitigating function. Only one policy is proposed for deletion. To the extent modification of Plan policies will negate the self-mitigating character of the General Plan, other unchanged policies and mitigation measures proposed in the EIR will supply the necessary reduction in potential impacts. Modifications of Plan policies are not expected to cause any new significant environmental impacts or render previously identified significant impacts substantially more severe.

2a. Issue (addition of new Plan Policies)

As stated above, the revised Plan would introduce new policies, including revised policies.

2b. Finding

These changes to the General Plan do not require recirculation of the EIR. Most of these new policies would have a self-mitigating effect on the adverse impacts of the General Plan. The new policies will not create significant new growth pressures not otherwise evaluated in the EIR. Accordingly, these policies are not expected to cause any new significant environmental impacts or render previously identified significant impacts substantially more severe.

XVI.
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

As set forth in the preceding sections, the Board of Supervisors' approval of the proposed General Plan will result in significant adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided even with the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures. Despite the occurrence of these effects, however, the Board of Supervisors chooses to approve the Project because, in its view, the economic, social, and other benefits that the Project will produce will render the significant effects acceptable.

The following statement identifies why, in the Board's judgment, the benefits of the Project as approved outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. Any one of these reasons is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Board would stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this section, and into the documents found in the Record of Proceedings, as defined in section VI.

The Board finds that the General Plan would have the following economic, social, and environmental benefits:

Improving the Jobs/Housing Balance in the County.

A jobs-housing ratio is the relationship between the total number of jobs and the total number of residential units in a region. The lower the jobs/housing ratio, the fewer number of jobs for residents, which results in workers commuting out of the area. The higher the ratio, the greater number of jobs in the area. A balance of jobs and housing can benefit the environment of an area by reducing commute times and distances between residential areas and employment centers. Longer commutes result in increased vehicle trip length, which creates environmental effects associated with transportation, air quality, and noise. One of the objectives of the 2002 Riverside County General Plan is to improve the jobs-to-housing balance within the unincorporated areas of the County. The unincorporated areas of the County currently have more housing than jobs. The land use designations and policies of the proposed General Plan have been tailored to improve that balance, thereby reducing commute times and distances between residential developments and employment centers, and associated environmental effects such as noise, air quality and traffic. (See FEIR, pp. 2-110, 2-266 (listing policies linking new housing to job creation).) The projections performed for the proposed General Plan indicate that during the life of the Plan, there will be a natural balancing of jobs and housing. (Tables 4.3.C and 4.3.D; see also, FEIR, p. 2-101.)

Diversification and Expansion of the County's Housing Stock

The proposed General Plan contains a number of policies which, when implemented, would serve to diversify and expand the County's housing stock. For example, within the Housing Element, there are actions that encourage and give priority to infill housing projects that would be affordable to lower income households, farm workers, seniors, and other special needs groups, who often have difficulty obtaining and keeping housing, especially in competitive markets. (See Actions 1.1d and 1.1i, Table H-1, Five-Year Action Plan Summary for Housing Element; FEIR, p. 2-265.)

Implementation of "Smart Growth" Principles to Reduce Demand on Transportation Systems

As encouraged by Caltrans in its comments dated October 4, 2002, and Sierra Club in its comments dated October 1, 2002, and noted by the County's responses, many of the policies contained in the proposed General Plan will support a safe, functional, interconnected, multi-modal circulation system that enables residents to live, work, shop, recreate, and go to school in the same area, creating distinct community centers that facilitate the use of pedestrian, bicycle and public modes of transportation, and thereby reducing the pressure to "sprawl." (See FEIR, pp. 2-30 to 2-33, 2-179, 2-241 to 2-242; Land Use Policies LU 2.1, LU 3.1, LU 12.1-12.4.)

Improvement to Roadways

While the region as a whole is expected to grow significantly over the life of the planning period, through the implementation of "smart growth" principles and improving the jobs-to-housing balance within the unincorporated areas of the County, a corresponding benefit will be some reduction in commute times, even as the number of vehicles on the road increases with population growth. Without the policies of the proposed General Plan promoting these benefits, the condition of roadways within the planning area could be expected to become much worse as the inevitable population growth occurs. Policies such as Land Use Policies LU 2.1, LU 3.1, LU 12.1-12.4 and Circulation Policies C 11.2-11.7, for example, aim to reduce reliance on automobiles, thereby reducing the burden on area roadways. (See FEIR, p. 2-241 to 2-242.)

Permanent Preservation of, and Public Access to, Open Space Areas.

The proposed General Plan contains several policies and mitigation measures that ensure the permanent preservation of, and public access to, open space areas. Ensuring these benefits now, before population pressures become even greater, and the political will to avoid developing these areas perhaps weakens, is especially important.

Economic Benefits from Taxes.

The Project will generate positive financial benefits to the City, local schools and other public agencies. The Project will generate increased property taxes. Retail sales generated by the Project and by Project-related employment will contribute significant revenues to the City from sales taxes. The Project will generate other revenues to the City and other governmental entities,

including development fees. These monies will benefit the City and other governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities.

F:\PCDATA\TLMA\GENERAL PLAN\CEQA revised findings text