



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT Planning Division

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

WARD: 1

1. **Case Number:** P13-0361
2. **Project Title:** William A. Cooper House Relocation
3. **Hearing Date:** July 17, 2013
4. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside
Community Development Department
Planning Division
3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Riverside, CA 92522
5. **Contact Person:** Teri Delcamp, Historic Preservation Senior Planner
Phone Number: (951) 826-2117
6. **Project Location:** From 3690 Adams Street to 2909 Lime Street
7. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
John and Jessica Dougherty
951-826-5213
5401 Gettysburg Avenue
Chino, CA 92701
8. **General Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential (MDR)
9. **Zoning:** Single Family Residential (R-1-7000)
10. **Description of Project:** (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to relocate a historic single-family residence known as the William A. Cooper House from 3690 Adams Street, located south of Magnolia Avenue, to the northerly vacant portion of the lot located at 2909 Lime Street. The applicants own the relocation site, and previously moved the existing Victorian home located on the southerly portion of the lot to this site in 2005. The Cooper House at 3690 Adams was designated a City Structure of Merit in 2002 (HD-002-012). Several recent studies, including the cultural resources report prepared for the current project, indicate that the Cooper House maintains its historic integrity.

The applicants have entered into an agreement with California Baptist University (CBU), which is the current owner of the Cooper House, to relocate the home to their property. The potential for the Cooper House to be relocated was anticipated in the recent Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) adopted with the approval of the CBU Specific Plan. However, no relocation site or applicant had been identified at that time, so some specific aspects of the environmental analysis are being prepared with the current project.

The Cooper House is proposed to be situated on the lot at 2909 Lime Street approximately 30 feet from the front property line; a detached two car garage will be constructed in the rear portion of the lot. The relocation site is

sufficiently large to allow for a second dwelling unit on the same site as an existing home, and would also meet minimum development standards for a separate lot if it were to be subdivided by a parcel map in the future. No variances are necessary for the proposed project.

11. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project’s surroundings:

	Existing Land Use	General Plan Designation	Zoning Designation
Project Site	Single Family Residence	Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Single Family Residential (R-1-7000)
North	Vacant	MDR	R-1-7000
East	Single Family Residence	MDR	R-1-7000
South	Single Family Residence	MDR	R-1-7000
West	Single Family Residence	MDR	R-1-7000

12. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financial approval, or participation agreement.):

None

13. Other Environmental Reviews Incorporated by Reference in this Review:

- a. General Plan 2025
- b. GP 2025 FPEIR
- c. “Cultural Resources Report and Evaluation of Impacts for the Proposed Relocation of the William A. Cooper House from 3690 Adams Street to 2909 Lime Street, Riverside, Riverside County, California,” prepared by City of Riverside Historic Preservation, Neighborhoods and Urban Design Division, June 2013

1. Acronyms

- AICUZ - Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study
- AQMP - Air Quality Management Plan
- AUSD - Alvord Unified School District
- CEQA - California Environmental Quality Act
- CMP - Congestion Management Plan
- EIR - Environmental Impact Report
- EMWD - Eastern Municipal Water District
- EOP - Emergency Operations Plan
- FEMA - Federal Emergency Management Agency
- FPEIR - GP 2025 Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report
- GIS - Geographic Information System
- GhG - Green House Gas
- GP 2025 - General Plan 2025
- IS - Initial Study
- LHMP - Local Hazard Mitigation Plan

MARB/MIP - March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
 MJPA-JLUS - March Joint Powers Authority - Joint Land Use Study
 MSHCP - Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan
 MVUSD - Moreno Valley Unified School District
 NCCP - Natural Communities Conservation Plan
 OEM - Office of Emergency Services
 OPR - Office of Planning & Research, State
 PEIR - Program Environmental Impact Report
 PW - Public Works, Riverside
 RCALUC - Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
 RCALUCP - Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
 RCP - Regional Comprehensive Plan
 RCTC - Riverside County Transportation Commission
 RMC - Riverside Municipal Code
 RPD - Riverside Police Department
 RPU - Riverside Public Utilities
 RTIP - Regional Transportation Improvement Plan
 RTP - Regional Transportation Plan
 RUSD - Riverside Unified School District
 SCAG - Southern California Association of Governments
 SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
 SCH - State Clearinghouse
 SKR-HCP - Stephens' Kangaroo Rat - Habitat Conservation Plan
 SWPPP - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
 USGS - United States Geologic Survey
 WMWD - Western Municipal Water District
 WQMP - Water Quality Management Plan

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation which reflects the independent judgment of the City of Riverside, it is recommended that:

The City of Riverside finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

The City of Riverside finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

The City of Riverside finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

The City of Riverside finds that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

The City of Riverside finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature 

Date July 17, 2013

Printed Name & Title John Field, Chair - Cultural Heritage Board

For City of Riverside



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

Environmental Initial Study

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. **Earlier Analysis Used.** Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. **Impacts Adequately Addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measure which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- 7) **Supporting Information Sources:** A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

1. AESTHETICS.
Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

1a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards and Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, and Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways)

No Impact. The proposed project would relocate one residence within an urbanized area, surrounded by existing development where there are no scenic vistas and where there are no direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to scenic vistas..

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

1b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways, the City’s Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, Title 20 – Cultural Resources and, Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones - RC Zone)

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no scenic highways within the City that could potentially be impacted. In addition, the proposed project is not located along a scenic boulevard, parkway, or special boulevard as designated by the City’s General Plan 2025 and therefore will not have any effect on any scenic resource within a scenic roadway. There are no rock outcroppings within view of this proposed project so no impacts to this resource are expected. The relocation site is located 100 feet north of the boundary of the St. Andrews Terraces Neighborhood Conservation Area (NCA) which is a historic area subject to the provisions of Title 20 (Cultural Resources) of the Riverside Municipal Code. The proposed relocation of the Cooper House, which was built in 1909 in the Craftsman style, will be an aesthetic enhancement of the area and in keeping with the predominantly Craftsman homes in the St. Andrews Terraces NCA. Lastly, the Zoning Code regulates building setbacks, building heights, land uses, landscaping, parking, and other development standards for use and development of all properties and the project complies with these standards. Therefore, any potential adverse direct, indirect or cumulative impacts on scenic resources from this project will be less than significant.

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

1c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Zoning Code, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines, Mission Inn and Seventh Street Historic Districts, and Downtown Specific Plan)

Less Than Significant Impact. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to relocate a historic single-family residences known as the Cooper House from 3960 Adams Street to 2909 Lime Street. The relocation site is within an urbanized residential area, adjacent to the St. Andrews Terraces Neighborhood Conservation Area with several similar style homes. The project proposes a similar setback from the street, thereby keeping the character and rhythm of the existing streetscape. Moreover, the home will be restored and will comply with the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior Standards and Title 20. Therefore, the proposed project will have a **less than significant impact** on the visual character and quality of the area directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

1d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-2 – Mount Palomar Lighting Area, Title 19 – Article VIII – Chapter 19.556 – Lighting, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines, Downtown Specific Plan and Mission Inn and Seventh Street Historic Districts Historic District)

No Impact. The addition of one single family home in a developed single family neighborhood has no potential to create a source of substantial light or glare so the project will have **no impact** in this regard.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:				
<p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2a. Response:</p> <p>No Impact. The project is located in an urbanized area of the City in an existing residential area and does not support agricultural resources or operations. There are no agricultural resources or operations, including farmlands within proximity of the subject site. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on agricultural uses.</p>				
<p>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-3 - Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Figure 5.2-4 – Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural Uses, and Title 19)</p> <p>No Impact. The site is within a built environment and no Williamson Act contracts are implemented on the site. The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or any applicable Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2c. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)</p> <p>No Impact. The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2d. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)</p> <p>No Impact. The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland, therefore no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2e. Response: (Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves, and GIS Map – Forest Data)</p> <p>No Impact. The project is located in an urbanized area of the City in an residential area and does not support agricultural resources or operations. The project will not result in the conversion of designated farmland to non-agricultural uses. In addition, there are no agricultural resources or operations, including farmlands within proximity of the subject site. The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively to conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or to the loss of forest land.</p>				
3. AIR QUALITY.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>3a. Response: (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP))</p> <p>No Impact. The proposed relocation of the Cooper House to 2909 Lime Street is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Program "Typical Growth Scenario" in all aspects. The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) sets forth a comprehensive program that will lead the SCAB into compliance with all Federal and State air quality standards. The City of Riverside is located within the Riverside County sub region of the SCAG projections. The General Plan 2025 FPEIR determined that implementation of the General Plan 2025 would generally meet attainment forecasts and attainment of the standards of the AQMP. The General Plan 2025 contains policies to promote mixed use, pedestrian-friendly communities that serve to reduce air pollutant emissions over time and this project is consistent with these policies. Because the proposed project is consistent with the 2007 AQMP, the proposed project will not conflict or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan – AQMP and therefore this project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.</p>				
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>3b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 AQMP, CalEEMod Model.</p>				
<p>No Impact. The project will not result in the violation of any ambient air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation because the project is proposed on a previously developed site containing one home, and grade supporting a previous railroad bridge abutment has already been removed from the site. Only minimal site preparation and ground disturbance typically associated with construction of a single family home foundation and house repair will occur. Construction will be short-lived and operational characteristics will be substantially the same as existing. Such criteria were not of sufficient quantities to trigger thresholds within the CalEEMod model for any required mitigation. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to ambient air quality or contribute to an existing air quality violation.</p>				
<p>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod 2007 Model</p>				
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. Per the GP 2025 FPEIR, AQMP thresholds indicate future construction activities under the General Plan are projected to result in significant levels of NOx and ROG, both ozone precursors, PM-10, PM-2.5 and CO. Although long-term emissions are expected to decrease by 2025, all criteria pollutants remain above the SCAQMD thresholds.</p>				
<p>The portion of the Basin within which the City is located is designated as a non-attainment area for ozone, PM-10 and PM-2.5 under State standards, and as a non-attainment area for ozone, carbon monoxide, PM-10, and PM-2.5 under Federal standards.</p>				
<p>Because the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, cumulative impacts related to criteria pollutants as a result of the project were previously evaluated as part of the cumulative analysis of build out anticipated under the General Plan 2025 Program. As a result, the proposed project does not result in any new significant impacts that were not previously evaluated and for which a statement of overriding considerations was adopted as part of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR. Therefore, cumulative air quality emissions impacts are less than significant.</p>				
<p>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod Model</p>				
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. Short-term impacts associated with construction from General Plan 2025 typical build out will result in very minimal increased air emissions from construction activities. Mitigation Measures of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR requires individual development to employ construction approaches that minimize pollutant emissions (General Plan 2025 FPEIR MM AIR 1- MM AIR 5, e.g., tuning equipment, limiting truck idling times) which will be required as standard conditions. Per 3b above, the project is not of sufficient quantities to trigger thresholds within the CalEEMod model for any required mitigation. Therefore, the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and a less than significant impact will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively for this project.</p>				
<p>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>3e. Response:</p> <p>No Impact. The project would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors because no odors are anticipated to be generated by the project. Therefore, no impact to creating objectionable odors will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area)</p> <p>No Impact. The project site is located on a previously developed site within an urbanized area and a search of the MSHCP database and other appropriate databases identified no potential for candidate, sensitive or special status species, Federal Species of Concern, California Species of Special Concern, and California Species Animal or Plants on lists 1-4 of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory or suitable habitat for such species on site. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively on habitat modifications, species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, and policies or regulations of the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p>				
<p>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools)</p> <p>No Impact. The project is located on a previously developed site within an urbanized area where no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community exists on site or within proximity to the project site. Therefore, the project will have no impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4c. Response: (Source: City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS Quad Map Layer)</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

No Impact. The project is located within an urbanized area where no federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) exist on site or within proximity to the project site. The project site does not contain any discernible drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils and thus does not include USACOE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact** to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

4d. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkage)

No Impact. The project is within an urbanized area and will not result in a barrier to the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** to wildlife movement directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

4e. Response: (Source: MSHCP, Title 16 Section 16.72.040 – Establishing the Western Riverside County MSHCP Mitigation Fee, Title 16 Section 16.40.040 – Establishing a Threatened and Endangered Species Fees, City of Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual)

Less Than Significant Impact. The General Plan 2025 includes policies to ensure that future development would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation policies, and the City also maintains an Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual for street rights-of-way and public parks and properties. This project has been reviewed against these policies and the manual, and found to be in compliance with these documents. The identified historic tree at the existing site is addressed under a mitigation measure for CBU adopted as part of their Specific Plan and is not a part of this project. However, that measure is reiterated in recommendations of the Cultural Resources report to ensure work for this project does not adversely affect the tree. Also as noted in 4a-d above, there are no endangered and threatened species on or near the site. For these reasons, the project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources and tree preservation.

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

4f. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan)

No Impact. The project site is located on a developed site within an urbanized area and will not impact an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan directly, indirectly and cumulatively. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** on the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.
Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

5a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas)

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

and Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code, City of Riverside Modernism Context Statement including Library DPR Form, and Page and Turnbull's Riverside Library Secretary of The Interior's Rehabilitation Standards Review, draft dated March 2013.)

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The proposed project consists of the relocation and continued preservation and use of the Cooper House as a single family residence. As such it is a Rehabilitation of a historical resource as defined under Section 15064.5 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Per the CEQA Guidelines the Cooper House is considered a historical resource because it has been designated a City Structure of Merit at its existing location. More recent studies, and the current cultural resources report prepared for the project, indicate that the Cooper House continues to retain its integrity. As a resource defined in Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code, the project is subject to review under a Certificate of Appropriateness application. A Certificate of Appropriateness application (case number P13-0361) has been reviewed pursuant to adopted City procedures (Title 20) to determine if the proposed project would have a significant adverse environmental effect as defined by CEQA.

No additions are proposed to the Cooper House and the intent of the project is to preserve the exterior character-defining features to the maximum extent possible. There will be some associated removal of certain elements and the house will be divided into three sections to accommodate the physical move of the house. However, the temporarily removed features will be inventoried and re-installed in their original location and configuration at the new site. The house will be restored with materials and features to match original where the sections are reconnected. All of the work will be required to follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Previous CR evaluations determined that the relocation of the Cooper House to another site would result in impacts that could be mitigated to a level that is less than significant in accordance with CEQA. These previous evaluations also concluded that the removal of the Cooper House would not adversely affect the integrity of the CBU campus potential historic district since the Cooper House is not a contributor to the district. The relocation of the Cooper House will also not adversely impact the character and significance of the St. Andrews Terraces NCA or other nearby resources. The relocation site is just north of the boundary of the NCA. Even so, the Cooper House, constructed in 1909 in the Craftsman style, is very compatible with the surrounding area developed predominantly with Craftsman style homes between 1911 and 1928. It is also compatible with the broader eligible St. Andrews Terraces Craftsman Historic District identified in the 2005 Northside Reconnaissance Survey for the same reasons.

In terms of the integrity of the Cooper House itself, the home has been noted to retain exceptional integrity in the aspects of location, design, materials, and workmanship, but the integrity of its setting, feeling, and association has been reduced over time by the early subdivision of the parcel, the disassociation of the residence itself with the families who built, resided and worked on the property as an agricultural or ranch use, and the changing use along Adams Street and in the vicinity that has compromised the rural, agricultural community environment. Because it retains its architectural integrity, its relocation to a different site will be less than significant with mechanisms in place to ensure that the work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and that the future preservation of the home is assured. The CR report finds that the Cooper House, pursuant to the mitigation measures below and the finding of significance, will be eligible for Structure of Merit designation at the new site. Through compliance with the following mitigation measures, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to historic resources will be **less than significant**.

Cultural Resources MM 1: Prior to issuance of a building permit to move the house, the applicant or designee shall comply with all requirements of the Building and Safety Division pursuant to Municipal Code Section 16.20 and any other regulations as necessary.

Cultural Resources MM 2: Prior to issuance of the required Over-the-Road House Move Permit, the applicant or designee shall provide to CHB staff a list describing all materials or features being temporarily removed for purposes of the house move. For all existing features that are to be removed and re-installed at the new site, the applicant or designee shall ensure the contractor has inventoried and numbered the features in their original locations, and has salvaged/stored said features for future re-installation. These may include pre-cut stone walls and columns, and concrete slab caps/coping on the porch; pre-cut stone and concrete slab caps/coping on the chimney(s); areas of wood trim; and window sashes if not protected in situ. Any additional features to be so treated shall be

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

submitted to CHB staff for approval. The deteriorated rear stairs to the attic, and the side porch concrete stairs, may be removed without inventorying and disposed of since these stairs will be reconstructed.

Cultural Resources MM 3: All work involved in moving the house, building the foundation at the new site, reconnecting the three sections of the house and restoring the exterior, including any repairs necessary as a result of damage to the house during the move, shall be completed in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to the satisfaction of the Historic Preservation Officer or Qualified Designee.

- a. The applicant or designee shall ensure that a reputable house moving company performs the preparation and relocation work using all appropriate mechanisms necessary to protect the house features and materials during the move.
- b. Features shall be restored and re-installed at the new site to match their original configuration, or be replaced like-for-like in materials, dimensions, colors, textures, finishes, and scoring patterns as appropriate, based on physical evidence and/or available pre-move photographs.
- c. The applicant or designee shall ensure that the house is protected after the move and before and during construction, which may include but is not limited to temporary site fencing, security, storage of features to be re-installed, and tarping over any exposed interiors before the sections are reconnected, etc., as necessary.

Cultural Resources MM 4: Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant or designee shall submit plans and/or materials for CHB staff approval that detail the following:

- a. The detached garage shall match the style, materials, roof pitch and color(s), etc., of the Cooper House.
- b. A set of concrete stairs and walkway shall lead from the public sidewalk to the Cooper House front door, similar in design, colors and finish to other historic examples existing in the St. Andrews Terraces NCA.
- c. Proposed paint chips shall be submitted consistent with the architectural style of the Cooper House.

Cultural Resources MM 5: Prior to approval of the final inspection, the applicant shall submit a historic designation application to the City to repeal the Structure of Merit designation of the existing site at 3690 Adams Avenue and to request designation of the Cooper House as a Structure of Merit at the new site at 2909 Lime Street. The application shall be processed in accordance with procedures outlined in Title 20 of the Municipal Code, and staff shall initiate a rezone case to add the Cultural Resources Overlay Zone to the existing R-1-7000 zoning of the new site.

Cultural Resources MM 6: Prior to scheduling of the designation and rezone cases for City Council consideration, the applicant or designee shall work with CHB staff to develop interpretive plaque language and identify an appropriate location at 2909 Lime Street that is visible to the public. Language shall reference the original site and purpose of the Cooper House; the date of the St. Andrews Terraces tract; and that other homes have been relocated into the area. The approved plaque shall be fabricated and installed by the applicant or designee following successful designation of the Cooper House as a Structure of Merit at 2909 Lime Street.

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

5b. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D – Cultural Resources Study)

Less Than Significant Impact. The project relocation site is a previously developed site which has had the upper layers of soil removed in the past and within an urbanized area. There is no potential for impacts associated with the relocation site. Due to construction date early in the 20th century and long period of habitation by persons engaged in a similar agricultural occupation on the existing site, there is a slight chance that the work to remove the house and clear the site at 3690 Adams may encounter unanticipated subsurface resources. With the following mitigation measure, the project will have a **less than significant impact** to an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Cultural Resources MM 7: In the event that work to clear the old site under the necessary demolition permit encounters unanticipated archaeological resources, the work shall be halted in that area until the City is notified and a significance determination can be made by an archaeologist. The owner shall hire a qualified archaeologist to inspect and evaluate the significance of the discovery; make recommendations, if necessary, for any monitoring or mitigation; and prepare a written report, in compliance with all applicable state and local laws and regulations.

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

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

5c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3)

No Impact. The project is located on a previously developed site within an urbanized area that is not known to be sensitive for paleontological resources and the nature of the project is minor to the point it would not affect resources if present. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** directly or indirectly on a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

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

5d. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity)

No Impact. The project is located on a previously developed site within an urbanized area whose pre-historic archaeological sensitivity is not high, and where the topsoil that formerly supported railroad bridge/abutments has been removed. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

Would the project:

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

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

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

6i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones & General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)

No Impact. Seismic activity is to be expected in Southern California. In the City of Riverside, there are no Alquist-Priolo zones. The project site does not contain any known fault lines and the potential for fault rupture or seismic shaking is low. Compliance with the California Building Code including California Historical Building Code regulations will ensure that **no impacts** related to strong seismic ground will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

6ii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)

No Impact. The San Jacinto Fault Zone located in the northeastern portion of the City, or the Elsinore Fault Zone, located in the southern portion of the City’s Sphere of Influence, have the potential to cause moderate to large earthquakes that would cause intense ground shaking. Because the proposed project complies with California Building Code including

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
California Historical Building Code regulations, impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively.				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6iii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)				
No Impact. The project site is located in an area with low potential for liquefaction as depicted in the General Plan 2025 Liquefaction Zones Map – Figure PS-2. Compliance with the California Building Code including California Historical Building Code regulations will ensure that impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction would have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively.				
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6iv. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code)				
No Impact. The project site and its surroundings have generally flat topography and are not located in an area prone to landslides per Figure 5.6-1 of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR. Therefore, there will be no impact related to landslides directly, indirectly and cumulatively.				
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code)				
No Impact. The project does not involve any extensive grading and will be landscaped for a single family dwelling. As such, the project will have no impact resulting in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Figure 5.6-1 - Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)				
No Impact. The project is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable and will not cause soil to become unstable as the project will not involve any extensive grading. As such, the project will have no impact resulting in a geologic unit or soil becoming unstable resulting in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Figure 5.6-5 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, and California Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code)				
No Impact. Expansive soil is defined under <i>California Building Code</i> . The soil type of the subject site is Hanford (See Figure 5.6-4 – Soils of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR. Hanford soils are characterized as having a low shrink-swell potential. As such, the project site will have no impact resulting in substantial risks to life or property due to expansive soils either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				
6e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types)				
No Impact. The project is served by sewer infrastructure. Therefore, the project will have no impact .				
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.				
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7a. Response:				
<p>No Impact. The impact of buildout of the City’s General Plan 2025 related to GhGs was analyzed in the Final PEIR on pages 5.3-1 – pages 5.3-54, and was addressed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations for the General Plan. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3, this impact need not be analyzed further, because (1) the proposed project would result in an impact that was previously analyzed in the Final PEIR, which was certified by the City; (2) the proposed project would not result in any GhG impacts that were not addressed in the Final PEIR; (3) no substantial new information shows that impacts of the project will be more significant than described in the Final PEIR; and (4) the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025.</p> <p>While Public Resources Code section 21083.3 requires that relevant mitigation measures from a General Plan EIR be imposed on a project that is invoking that section’s limited exemption from CEQA, the mitigation measures in the Final PEIR impose obligations on the City, not applicants, and so do not directly apply. Moreover, the proposed project will not result in a net increase in GhG emissions because it is so small in scope involving only the relocation of a house from one site in Riverside to another. Therefore, this project will have no impact with respect to GhG emissions.</p>				
b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7b. Response:				
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. The SCAQMD supports State, Federal and international policies to reduce levels of ozone depleting gases through its Global Warming Policy and rules and has established an interim Greenhouse Gas (GhG) threshold. As indicated in 7a above, the project need not be analyzed further, because (1) the proposed project would result in an impact that was previously analyzed in the Final PEIR, which was certified by the City; (2) the proposed project would not result in any GhG impacts that were not addressed in the Final PEIR; (3) no substantial new information shows that impacts of the project will be more significant than described in the Final PEIR; and (4) the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025. In addition, the project would comply with any applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations during construction. Therefore, the project will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation related to the reduction in the emissions of GhG and thus a less than significant impact will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively in this regard.</p>				
8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.				
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, Riverside Fire Department EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM’s Strategic Plan)</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>No Impact. The proposed project does not involve the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material because the use is an existing residence that will be relocated to another lot in Riverside. Therefore, the project will have no impact related to the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material either directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7 A – D, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM’s Strategic Plan)</p>				
<p>No Impact. The proposed project does not involve the use of any hazardous materials. As such the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively for creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.</p>				
<p>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety and Education Elements, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.7-D - CalARP RMP Facilities in the Project Area, Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D RUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-3 AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E AUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code)</p>				
<p>No Impact. The proposed project would relocate one residence within an urbanized area on a previously developed site surrounded by existing development. Moreover, the proposed project does not involve the handling of any hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing school. Therefore, the project will have no impact regarding emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-5 – Hazardous Waste Sites, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7-A – CERCLIS Facility Information, Figure 5.7-B – Regulated Facilities in TRI Information and 5.7-C – DTSC EnviroStor Database Listed Sites)</p>				
<p>No Impact. A review of hazardous materials site lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 found that the project site is not included on any such lists. Therefore, the project would have no impact to creating any significant hazard to the public or environment directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas)</p>				
<p>No Impact. The project site is not located within any airport land use plan area or compatibility zone. Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
8f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas)				
No Impact. Because the proposed project is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8g. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.7 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, and OEM’s Strategic Plan)				
No Impact. The project will not result in physical alterations to the project site that would impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency plan. Therefore, no impact , either directly, indirectly or cumulatively to an emergency response or evacuation plan will occur.				
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Hazard Areas, GIS Map Layer VHFSZ 2010, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 http://intranet/Portal/uploads/Riv_City_EOP_complete.pdf , Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1/Part 2 and OEM’s Strategic Plan)				
No Impact. The proposed project is located in an urbanized area where no wildlands exist and the property is not located within a Very High Fire Severity Zone (VHFSZ) or adjacent to wildland areas or a VHFSZ; therefore no impact regarding wildland fires either directly, indirectly or cumulatively from this project will occur.				
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.				
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Beneficial Uses Receiving, GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.8-1)				
Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is located within the Santa Ana River Watershed. The project will have minimal physical alterations to the project site but not of a magnitude that would violate water quality or water quality standards because the project involves relocating an existing home to a residential site. The permeable area and impervious surface areas of the project site will increase somewhat. A majority of the flows from the site will be captured in the on-street gutters and conveyed to retention basins for infiltration. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to any water quality standards or waste discharge.				
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, RPU Map of Water Supply Basins, RPU Urban Water Management Plan)				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>No Impact. The proposed project is located within the Riverside South Water Supply Basin. The project will not directly or indirectly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with ground water recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level as there are only minor physical alterations to the project site. The proposed project would relocate a residence within an urbanized area on a previously developed site surrounded by existing development. The relocated residence will be required to connect to the City's sewer system and comply with all NPDES and WQMP requirements that will ensure the proposed project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Therefore, there will no impact to groundwater supplies and recharge either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9c. Response:</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The project will not directly or indirectly result in physical alterations to the project site that would substantially alter the existing drainage patterns of the site because the project site is within an urbanized area on a previously developed site surrounded by existing development and no erosion or siltation on- or off-site will occur. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to existing drainage patterns.</p>				
<p>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9d. Response:</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. For same reasons in response 9c above.</p>				
<p>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9e. Response:</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. For same reasons in response 9c above.</p>				
<p>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9f. Response:</p> <p>No Impact. The project will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or physical alteration of the site or surrounding area, (i.e. through grading, ground disturbance, structures or additional paving) that would create or contribute runoff water which would substantially degrade water quality because the project would relocate one residence within an urbanized area on a previously developed site. Therefore, the project will not degrade water quality and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9g. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps)</p>				
<p>No Impact. A review of General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas and the National Flood</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0726G Effective Date August 28, 2008) and Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas of the General Plan Program FPEIR, shows that the minor construction project 1) is not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard area; 2) not subject to dam inundation; and) does not involve the construction of housing. There will be no impact caused by this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively as it will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.				
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps) No Impact. For same reasons in response 9g above.				
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps) No Impact. For same reasons in response 9g above.				
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9j. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.8 – Hydrology and Water Quality) No Impact. Tsunamis are large waves that occur in coastal areas; therefore, since the City is not located in a coastal area, no impacts due to tsunamis will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively. Additionally, the proposed project site and its surroundings is within an urbanized area not within proximity to Lake Mathews, Lake Evans, the Santa Ana River, Lake Hills, Norco Hills, Box Springs Mountain Area or any of the 9 arroyos which transverse the City and its sphere of influence. Therefore, no impact potential for seiche or mudflow exists either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Project site plan, City of Riverside GIS/CADME map layers) No Impact. The proposed project would relocate one residence within an urbanized area on a previously developed/improved site completely surrounded by existing development. The project can be considered an infill project as it would be served by fully improved public streets and other infrastructure. Further, the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, the Zoning Code, the Subdivision Code and the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines, and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Therefore, no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to an established community will occur. The project is consistent with and fits into the pattern of development of the surrounding area providing adequate access, circulation and connectivity consistent with the General Plan 2025, and in compliance with the requirements of the Zoning and Subdivision Codes. Therefore, no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to an established community will occur.				
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Figure LU-7 – Redevelopment Areas, Downtown Specific Plan,				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)

No Impact. The proposed project is an infill-type project consistent with the General Plan 2025 and Zoning Code. It is not located within other plan areas and it is not a project of Statewide, Regional, or Areawide significance. For these reasons this project will have **no impact** on an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

10c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Figure LU-7 – Redevelopment Areas, Downtown Specific Plan, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)

No Impact. For same reasons in response 4f above.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
---	--	--	--	--

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

11a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)

No Impact. The project does not involve extraction of mineral resources or grading activity. No mineral resources have been identified on the project site and there is no historical use of the site or surrounding area for mineral extraction purposes. The project site is not, nor is it adjacent to, a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the General Plan 2025, specific plan or other land use plan. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** on mineral resources directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

11b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)

No Impact. The GP 2025 FPEIR determined that there are no specific areas with the City of Sphere Area which have locally-important mineral resource recovery sites and that the implementation of the General Plan 2025 would not significantly preclude the ability to extract state-designated resources. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025. Therefore, there is **no impact**.

12. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
---	--	--	--	--

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

12a. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards)

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not involve uses that would increase ambient noise levels as the project would relocate one residence within an urbanized area on a previously developed/improved site completely

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>surrounded by existing development. A temporary increase in noise levels due to the relocation of the residence may occur, as it will require the use of heavy equipment, which may exceed the noise standards established by Title 7 (Noise) of the Riverside Municipal Code. The exact amount of noise generated will be determined on the type and amount of equipment used for the relocation and is unknown at this time. Title 7 limits construction-type related activities in a residential neighborhood from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction noise is permitted on Sundays or federal holidays. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on the exposure of persons to or the generation of noise levels in excess of established City standards directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12b. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, FPEIR Table 5.11-G – Vibration Source Levels For Construction Equipment, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions)</p> <p>No Impact. The proposed project does not involve uses or activities that would result in any exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The project involves the relocation of a single family dwelling into an existing single family area. Construction will be of short duration and will not generate excessive noise. Standard conditions will apply that require the project to comply with all applicable codes and regulations, which include the City’s Noise Ordinance and construction hours. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the exposure of persons to the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12c. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards)</p> <p>No Impact. For same reasons in responses 12a and 12 b above.</p>				
<p>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction Equipment Noise Levels, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)</p> <p>No Impact. See response 12.a above.</p>				
<p>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contour, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999))</p> <p>No Impact. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and as such will have no impact on people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999) and Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))</p> <p>No Impact. Per the GP 2025 Program FPEIR, there are no private airstrips within the City that would expose people working or residing in the City to excessive noise levels. Because the proposed project consists of development anticipated under the General Plan 2025, is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.				
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table LU-3 – Land Use Designations, FPEIR Table 5.12-A – SCAG Population and Households Forecast, Table 5.12-B – General Plan Population and Employment Projections–2025, Table 5.12-C – 2025 General Plan and SCAG Comparisons, Table 5.12-D - General Plan Housing Projections 2025, Capital Improvement Program and SCAG’s RCP and RTP)</p> <p>No Impact. The project is in an urbanized area and does not propose a new home, only a relocated home from another site in Riverside so it would not directly induce substantial population growth, and does not involve the addition of new roads or infrastructure that would indirectly induce substantial population growth. Therefore, this project will have no impact on population growth either directly or indirectly.</p>				
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13b. Response: (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)</p> <p>No Impact. The project will not displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the project site simply relocates an existing house to another site all within Riverside. Therefore, there will be no impact on existing housing requiring replacement housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13c. Response: (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)</p> <p>No Impact. The project will not displace any people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the house is vacant and is being relocated to a residential parcel. Therefore, this project will have no impact on displacing people, necessitating the need for replacement housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14a. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1)				
No Impact. Adequate fire facilities and services are provided by existing fire stations. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Fire Department practices, there will be no impacts on the demand for additional fire facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers)				
No Impact. Adequate police facilities and services are provided by the North Neighborhood Policing Center located at 4102 Orange Street to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Police Department practices, there will be no impacts on the demand for additional police facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14c. Response:				
No Impact. Adequate school facilities and services are provided by the Riverside Unified School District to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Riverside Unified School District impact fees used to offset the impact of new development, there will be no impact on the demand for additional school facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Parks Master Plan 2003, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative)				
No Impact. Adequate park facilities and services are provided in the Downtown Neighborhood to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Park, Recreation and Community Services practices, there will be no impact on the demand for additional park facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure LU-8 – Community Facilities, FPEIR Figure 5.13-5 - Library Facilities, Figure 5.13-6 - Community Centers, Table 5.3-F – Riverside Community Centers, Table 5.13-H – Riverside Public Library Service Standards)				
No Impact. Adequate public facilities and services, including libraries and community centers, are provided in the Downtown Neighborhood to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Park, Recreation and Community Services and Library practices, there will be no impacts on the demand for additional public facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. RECREATION.				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15a. Response: No Impact. The project will not result in an intensification of land use and therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional recreational facilities either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15b. Response: No Impact. The project will not include new recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore, there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project result in:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16a. Response: No Impact. The project site is located on a previously developed/improved site where no increase in intensity of use resulting in any measurable increase in traffic would occur and therefore no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the capacity of the existing circulation system will occur.				
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG’s RTP)</i> No Impact. The project site does not include a state highway or principal arterial within Riverside County’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) and the project is consistent with the Transportation Demand Management/Air Quality components of the Program; therefore, there is no impact either directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the CMP.				
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

in substantial safety risks?

16c. Response:

No Impact. The project will not change air traffic patterns, increase air traffic levels or change the location of air traffic patterns. It is not located within an airport influence area. As such, this project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively on air traffic patterns.

d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

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

16d. Response:

No Impact. The project is located on a site that is within a developed area, where no site modifications will occur that would result in hazards due to design features such as intersection improvements, etc.. In addition, the proposed use is compatible with other uses in the area. As such, the project will have **no impact** on increasing hazards through design or incompatible uses either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

16e. Response: (Source: California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, Municipal Code, and Fire Code)

No Impact. The project is located on a site that is currently developed, with all site improvements in place, and where no site modifications are proposed that would affect emergency access; therefore there will be **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to emergency access.

f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities)?

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

16f. Response: (Source: FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation and Community Mobility and Education Elements, Bicycle Master Plan, School Safety Program – Walk Safe! – Drive Safe!)

No Impact. The project is located on a site that is currently developed, with all site improvements in place, and where no site modifications will occur that would result in conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks). As such, the project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively on adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES.

Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

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

17a. Response:

No Impact. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The project is located on a site that is currently developed, where no site modifications are proposed that would affect wastewater treatment; therefore there will be **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to wastewater treatment.

b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

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

17b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU PROJECTED DOMESTIC WATER Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, FPEIR Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU Including Water Reliability for 2025, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City)

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

of Riverside’s Sewer Service, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities and Figure 5.16-6 – Sewer Infrastructure and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)

No Impact. The project will not result in the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project is consistent with the Typical Growth Scenario of the General Plan 2025 where future water and wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I, 5.16-J and 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, the project will have **no impact** resulting in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

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

17c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities)

No Impact. The project is located on a previously developed/improved site within an urbanized area where no increase in impervious surfaces will occur beyond that which would be expected for a typical residential use or which would result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** resulting in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

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

17d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-3 – Water Service Areas, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities, Table 5.16-E – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR, Table 5.16-F – Projected Water Demand, Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU including Water Reliability for 2025, RPU Master Plan)

No Impact. The project will not exceed expected water supplies. The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth Scenario where future water supplies were determined to be adequate (see Tables t.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I and 5.16-J of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, the project will have **no impact** resulting in the insufficient water supplies either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

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

17e. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 - Sewer Service Areas, Figure 5.16-6 -Sewer Infrastructure, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)

No Impact. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of (Regional Water Quality Control Board). The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth Scenario where future wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Table 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Further, the current Wastewater Treatment Master Plan anticipates and provides for this type of project. Therefore, **no impact** to wastewater treatment directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

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

17f. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.16-A – Existing Landfills and Table 5.16-M – Estimated Future Solid Waste Generation from the Planning Area)

No Impact. The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Build-out Project level where future landfill capacity was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-A and 5.16-M of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, **no impact** to landfill capacity will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

17g. Response: (Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002 Landfill Facility Compliance Study)

No Impact. The California Integrated Waste Management Act under the Public Resource Code requires that local jurisdictions divert at least 50% of all solid waste generated by January 1, 2000. The City is currently achieving a 60% diversion rate, well above State requirements. In addition, the California Green Building Code requires all developments to divert 50% of non-hazardous construction and demolition debris for all projects and 100% of excavated soil and land clearing debris for all non-residential projects beginning January 1, 2011. The proposed project must comply with the City's waste disposal requirements as well as the California Green Building Code and as such would not conflict with any Federal, State, or local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, **no impacts** related to solid waste statutes will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or an endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

18a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas, Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity, Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code, and Page and Turnbull's Riverside Library Secretary of The Interior's Rehabilitation Standards Review, draft dated March 2013)

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. Potential impacts related to habitat of fish or wildlife species were discussed in the Biological Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were all found to be **less than significant**. Additionally, potential impacts to cultural, archaeological and paleontological resources related to major periods of California and the City of Riverside's history or prehistory were discussed in the Cultural Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were found to be **less than significant with mitigation**.

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

18b. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program)

Less Than Significant Impact. Because the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, no new cumulative impacts are anticipated and therefore cumulative impacts of the proposed project beyond those previously considered in the GP 2025 FPEIR are **less than significant**.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program)				
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. Effects on human beings were evaluated as part of the aesthetics, air quality, hydrology & water quality, noise, population and housing, hazards and hazardous materials, and traffic sections of this initial study and found to be less than significant for each of the above sections. Based on the analysis and conclusions in this initial study, the project will not cause substantial adverse effects, directly or indirectly to human beings. Therefore, potential direct and indirect impacts on human beings that result from the proposed project are less than significant.</p>				

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151, Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).

Staff Recommended Mitigation Measures

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ¹	Monitoring/Reporting Method
Cultural Resources	<p>Cultural Resources MM 1: Prior to issuance of a building permit to move the house, the applicant or designee shall comply with all requirements of the Building and Safety Division pursuant to Municipal Code Section 16.20 and any other regulations as necessary.</p> <p>Cultural Resources MM 2: Prior to issuance of the required Over-the-Road House Move Permit, the applicant or designee shall provide to CHB staff a list describing all materials or features being temporarily removed for purposes of the house move. For all existing features that are to be removed and re-installed at the new site, the applicant or designee shall ensure the contractor has inventoried and numbered the features in their original locations, and has salvaged/stored said features for future re-installation. These may include pre-cut stone walls and columns, and concrete slab caps/coping on the porch; pre-cut stone and concrete slab caps/coping on the chimney(s); areas of wood trim; and window sashes if not protected in situ. Any additional features to be so treated shall be submitted to CHB staff for approval. The deteriorated rear stairs to the attic, and the side porch concrete stairs, may be removed without inventorying and disposed of since these stairs will be reconstructed.</p> <p>Cultural Resources MM 3: All work involved in moving the house, building the foundation at the new site, reconnecting the three sections of the house and restoring the exterior, including any repairs necessary as a result of damage to the house during the move, shall be completed in a</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance of a demolition and/or building permit.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of a demolition and/or building permit.</p> <p>Prior to approval of final inspection.</p>	<p>Planning Division</p> <p>Planning Division</p> <p>Planning Division</p>	<p>Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval via plancheck and inspections.</p> <p>Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval via plancheck and inspections.</p> <p>Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval via inspections.</p>

¹ All agencies are City of Riverside Departments/Divisions unless otherwise noted.

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ¹	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	<p>manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to the satisfaction of the Historic Preservation Officer or Qualified Designee.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The applicant or designee shall ensure that a reputable house moving company performs the preparation and relocation work using all appropriate mechanisms necessary to protect the house features and materials during the move. b. Features shall be restored and re-installed at the new site to match their original configuration, or be replaced like-for-like in materials, dimensions, colors, textures, finishes, and scoring patterns as appropriate, based on physical evidence and/or available pre-move photographs. c. The applicant or designee shall ensure that the house is protected after the move and before and during construction, which may include but is not limited to temporary site fencing, security, storage of features to be re-installed, and tarping over any exposed interiors before the sections are reconnected, etc., as necessary. <p>Cultural Resources MM 4: Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant or designee shall submit plans and/or materials for CHB staff approval that detail the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The detached garage shall match the style, materials, roof pitch and color(s), etc., of the Cooper House. b. A set of concrete stairs and walkway shall lead from the public sidewalk to 	<p>Prior to the issuance of a building permit.</p>	<p>Planning Division</p>	<p>Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval via plancheck</p>

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ¹	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	<p>the Cooper House front door, similar in design, colors and finish to other historic examples existing in the St. Andrews Terraces NCA.</p> <p>c. Proposed paint chips shall be submitted consistent with the architectural style of the Cooper House.</p> <p>Cultural Resources MM 5: Prior to approval of the final inspection, the applicant shall submit a historic designation application to the City to repeal the Structure of Merit designation of the existing site at 3690 Adams Avenue and to request designation of the Cooper House as a Structure of Merit at the new site at 2909 Lime Street. The application shall be processed in accordance with procedures outlined in Title 20 of the Municipal Code, and staff shall initiate a rezoning case to add the Cultural Resources Overlay Zone to the existing R-1-7000 zoning of the new site.</p> <p>Cultural Resources MM 6: Prior to scheduling of the designation and rezoning cases for City Council consideration, the applicant or designee shall work with CHB staff to develop interpretive plaque language and identify an appropriate location at 2909 Lime Street that is visible to the public. Language shall reference the original site and purpose of the Cooper House; the date of the St. Andrews Terraces tract; and that other homes have been relocated into the area. The approved plaque shall be fabricated and installed by the applicant or designee following successful designation of the Cooper House as a Structure of Merit at 2909 Lime Street.</p>	<p>Prior to approval of final inspection.</p> <p>In conjunction with SOM designation application</p>	<p>Planning Division</p> <p>Planning Division</p>	<p>Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval via inspections.</p> <p>In conjunction with designation application, prior to final consideration by Council.</p>

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ¹	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	<p>Cultural Resources MM 7: In the event that work to clear the old site under the necessary demolition permit encounters unanticipated archaeological resources, the work shall be halted in that area until the City is notified and a significance determination can be made by an archaeologist. The owner shall hire a qualified archaeologist to inspect and evaluate the significance of the discovery; make recommendations, if necessary, for any monitoring or mitigation; and prepare a written report, in compliance with all applicable state and local laws and regulations.</p>	<p>Prior to final inspection of original site</p>	<p>Planning/Building</p>	<p>Inspections</p>