FIRSTCARBONSOLUTIONS™

DRAFT
Focused Environmental Impact Report
Casa Blanca Elementary School Project
City of Riverside, Riverside County, California

State Clearinghouse Number 2018101073

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Prepared for:
Riverside Unified School District
Facilities Planning and Development Department
3070 Washington Street
Riverside, CA 92504
951.788.7496

Contact: Ana Gonzalez, Director

Prepared by:
FirstCarbon Solutions
250 Commerce, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92602
714.508.4100

Contact: Kerri Tuttle, Project Director
Charles Holcombe, Senior Project Manager
Angela Wolfe, Project Manager

Date: March 26, 2019

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose

This Draft Focused Environmental Impact Report (Draft Focused EIR) has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the Casa Blanca Elementary School Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2018101073). This document has been prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code [PRC], § 21000, et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, § 15000, et seq.).

The purpose of this Draft Focused EIR is to inform decision makers, representatives of affected and responsible agencies, the public, and other interested parties of the potential environmental effects that may result from implementation of the proposed project. This Draft Focused EIR describes potential impacts relating to a wide variety of environmental issues and methods by which these impacts can be mitigated or avoided.

Proposed Project Location

The proposed project site is located in the City of Riverside, in Riverside County, California (Exhibit 2-1). The site is specifically within the Casa Blanca Neighborhood on the northern side of Lincoln Avenue and Sonora Place (Exhibit 2-2) at 7351 Lincoln Avenue (Assessor's Parcel Number [APN]: 230-360-001). The KPRO 1570 AM radio station transmitter building and antenna system previously occupied the 9.8-acre project site. The four antenna structures and building have since been removed.

The project area is mostly undeveloped and consists of a square-shaped parcel totaling 9.8 acres. The project site, located in a relatively flat area that slopes gently to the northwest with no existing buildings or structures, is currently vacant. Based on historical aerial photographic research, the site was first developed as an AM radio station in the late 1960s. Prior to its use as a radio station, the site was used for agricultural purposes. Access to the site is available from State Route 91 (SR-91).

The project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards and no active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are known to pass directly beneath the site (City of Riverside 2018). The project would not place any proposed buildings or development over a fault line. Potential project impacts with respect to geological hazards are discussed in detail in the Geology and Soils section of this Draft Focused EIR.

The project site and surrounding areas are within the City of Riverside. The Casa Blanca Neighborhood includes a mix of uses surrounding the project site, including the Church of Christ to the east, residential uses to the west and south, and a baseball field and community center to the north of the site. Adjoining properties include single-family residential development to the west and south, a grass field, the SSgt. Salvador J. Lara Casa Blanca Public Library to the west, Lincoln Avenue Church of Christ and various government buildings to the east, and Villegas Park to the north and

northeast of the site. SR-91 is located 0.7 mile northwest of the site, and Interstate 60 (I-60) is located 4.6 miles southwest of the site. Most of the surrounding area is used for residential purposes, as the community plan recommends preserving and protecting the neighborhood's single-family character.

Project Description

The Riverside Unified School District (RUSD) is proposing to construct a new K-6 campus known as Casa Blanca Elementary School (project) on a 9.8-acre site at 7351 Lincoln Avenue in the City of Riverside (Assessor's Parcel Number: 230-360-001). The City of Riverside General Plan 2025 designates the project site as High Density Residential (HDR) with the current zoning designated as R-3-1500—for Multi-Family Residential zone. The California legislature grants school districts the power to exempt school property from county and city zoning requirements, provided the school district complies with the terms of Government Code Section 53094. As lead agency for the project, it is anticipated that RUSD will comply with Government Code Section 53094 to render the local county and city zoning ordinances inapplicable to the project to the extent such ordinances would not otherwise permit the proposed school use. Within 10 days of the action, the Board will provide notice of this action to the County and the City. Following this process, the project would not conflict with plans or policies. Alternatively, the City could process a General Plan Amendment (GPA) and Rezone to Public Facilities use.

The project consists of a 1-story 11,000-square-foot multi-purpose/food service building, a 1-story 6,500-square-foot administration building, a 2-story 83,000-square-foot classroom, and a library and kindergarten building with a capacity to serve up to 800 students (Exhibit 2-3). In addition to the main buildings, the site proposes to include outdoor recreation space consisting of a 13,500-square-foot kindergarten playground, 29,500-square-foot quad and courtyard with lunch shelter, 36,800-square-foot hardcourt area, 143,500-square-foot playfields (baseball, basketball, and soccer fields), a 4,000-square-foot outdoor Science Grow Lab, and associated soft edge landscaping totaling 240,870 square feet.

A total of four driveways would provide ingress/egress to the project. All driveways fronting Lincoln Avenue are restricted to right-in and right-out turning only. There are three proposed on-site parking lots: (1) a 47,200-square-foot staff parking lot with 84 stalls and a bus drop-off area for up to three buses to cue; (2) a 16,000-square-foot kindergarten parking lot with 24 spaces and a drop-off area for up to eleven cars to cue; and (3) a 17,000-square-foot visitor parking lot with 24 spaces and a parent drop-off area for up to 16 cars to cue. Combined, the three proposed lots will be 80,200 square feet and have 132 parking spaces.

The new campus would serve students living in the Casa Blanca Neighborhood school boundary (Exhibit 2-4). School instruction would begin in early August until the end of May, operating 181 days out of the year for students with a few additional workdays for teachers. The facilities would be unoccupied for some holidays and for longer periods during the months of November, December, January, and March. Daily hours of operation for instruction would align with surrounding elementary schools: Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 8:05 a.m. to 2:30 p.m., and Wednesday from 8:05 a.m. to 1:15 p.m. An afterschool program has not been established at this

time. However, in the event a program is established, students will be on campus from the end of school until 6:00 p.m. each day.

Construction

Prior to construction of the project, building foundations would need to be established through grading and paving. The proposed buildings and associated infrastructure would stay consistent with development standards and the surrounding architecture. The anticipated start of construction is June 2020.

Operation

During the operational phase of the project, Casa Blanca Elementary School would provide academic services and accommodations to a maximum of 800 K-6 students within the Casa Blanca neighborhood that extends from Mary Street to Jefferson Street between Indiana Avenue and Victoria Avenue. Development of the school would establish new facilities in a community where demand for additional academic services and facilities is high, especially at the elementary level.

Project Objectives

The objectives of the project are to:

- **OBJ-1:** Provide an educational institution to serve the Casa Blanca neighborhood and surrounding areas.
- **OBJ-2:** Relieve over-capacity at neighboring schools.
- **OBJ-3:** Establish new facilities in a community where the demand for additional academic services and facilities is high, especially at the elementary school level.
- **OBJ-4:** Establish an educational facility that serves to connect and enhance an existing neighborhood.

Discretionary approvals and permits are required prior to implementation of the project. The project application would require the following discretionary approvals and actions, including:

- Site Plan and Design Review from RUSD, California Division of State Architect, and/or drainage and road improvement and related grading purposes from the City of Riverside.
- Land Acquisition Agreement.
- Vote of the RUSD Board per Government Code Section 53094 allowing an exemption to zoning requirements for school building projects; alternatively General Plan and Zoning Code Map Amendment from the City of Riverside and Planning Commission.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The project would result in the following significant unavoidable impacts:

- **Transportation and Traffic:** The project would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, 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 bicycle paths, and mass transit.

Summary of Project Alternatives

Below is a summary of the alternatives to the project considered in Section 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.

No Project Alternative

- Under the no project alternative, the site would remain in its existing condition and no development would occur.

Reduced Size Alternative

- Under the Reduced Size Alternative, the project would be reduced by 25 percent.

Multi-Family Residential Alternative

- Under the Multi-Family Residential Alternative, the site would be used for a 210-unit condominium community as opposed to its current plan of an elementary school.

Alternate Location Alternative

- Under the Alternate Location Alternative, the project would be developed on one of four vacant lots along Victoria Avenue. Potential alternative sites include Lot B on the corner of Washington Street and Victoria Avenue, Lot C on the corner of Victoria Avenue and Grace Street, Lot D on the corner of Victoria Avenue and Madison Street, and Lot E on the corner of Victoria Avenue and the opposite side of Madison Street. For purposes of this alternative analysis, only Lot B was selected and analyzed.

Areas of Controversy

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b), a summary section must address areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, and it must also address issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the project was issued on October 24, 2018. The NOP describing the original concept for the project and issues to be addressed in the Focused EIR was distributed to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and other interested parties for a 30-day public review

period extending from October 24, 2018 through November 23, 2018. The NOP identified the potential for significant impacts on the environment related to the following topical areas:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural and Tribal Resources
- Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Public Services
- Transportation and Traffic

The NOP and comments received in response to the NOP are included in Appendix A.

Disagreement Among Experts

This Draft Focused EIR contains substantial evidence to support all the conclusions presented herein. It is possible that there will be disagreement among various parties regarding these conclusions, although the RUSD is not aware of any disputed conclusions at the time of this writing. Both the CEQA Guidelines and case law clearly provide the standards for treating disagreement among experts. Where evidence and opinions conflict on an issue concerning the environment, and the lead agency knows of these controversies in advance, the EIR must acknowledge the controversies, summarize the conflicting opinions of the experts, and include sufficient information to allow the public and decision makers to make an informed judgment about the environmental consequences of the project.

Potentially Controversial Issues

Below is a list of potentially controversial issues that may be raised during the public review and hearing process of this Draft Focused EIR:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural and Tribal Resources
- GHG Emissions
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Public Services
- Transportation and Traffic

It is also possible that evidence will be presented during the statutory Draft Focused EIR public review period identified in the Notice of Completion (NOC)[1] that may create disagreement. Decision makers would consider this evidence during the public hearing process.

In rendering a decision on a project where there is disagreement among experts, the decision makers are not obligated to select the most environmentally preferable viewpoint. Decision makers are vested with the ability to choose whatever viewpoint is preferable and need not resolve a dispute among experts. In their proceedings, decision makers must consider comments received

[1] The Notice of Completion identifies the public review period for this Draft Focused EIR. The minimum public review period for an EIR is 30 days. When a DEIR is sent to the State Clearinghouse for review, as in this case, the public review period must be 45 days unless the Clearinghouse approves a shorter period. Because the proposed project is not of statewide, areawide or regional environmental significance, RUSD requested a shortened review period in writing, and the responsible and trustee agencies were contacted and agreed to the shortened review period. The shortened review period was requested due to the severe time constraints that RUSD is operating under acquire the project site.

concerning the adequacy of the Draft Focused EIR and address any objections raised in these comments. However, decision makers are not obligated to follow any directives, recommendations, or suggestions presented in comments on the Draft Focused EIR, and can certify the Final Focused EIR without needing to resolve disagreements among experts.

Public Review of the Draft Focused EIR

Upon completion of the Draft Focused EIR, the RUSD filed a NOC with the State Office of Planning and Research to begin the public review period (Public Resources Code Section 21161). RUSD requested a shortened public review period of 30 days for the project pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21091.Please see the NOC for the dates of the public review period for this Draft Focused EIR. Concurrent with the NOC, this Draft Focused EIR has been distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, surrounding cities, and interested parties, as well as all parties requesting a copy of the Draft Focused EIR in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21092(b)(3). During the public review period, the Draft Focused EIR, including the technical appendices, is available for review at the RUSD Operations Division – Planning and Development online addresses:

http://www.riversideunified.org/departments/operations_division/facilities_planning_development

In addition, the Draft Focused EIR is available at the following locations:

Riverside Unified School District
3070 Washington Street
Riverside, CA 92504

Riverside Unified School District
3380 14th Street
Riverside, CA 92501

Agencies, organizations, and interested parties have the opportunity to comment on the Draft Focused EIR during the public review period identified in the NOC. Written comments on this Draft Focused EIR should be addressed to:

Ana Gonzalez, Director
Facilities Planning and Development Department
Riverside Unified School District
3070 Washington Street
Riverside, CA 92504
Phone: 951.788.7496
Email:AnaGonzalez@rusd.k12.ca.us

Submittal of electronic comments in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF format is encouraged. Upon completion of the public review period, written responses to all significant environmental issues raised will be prepared and made available for review by the commenting agencies at least 10 days prior to the public hearing before the RUSD on the project, at which the certification of the Final Focused EIR will be considered. Comments received and the responses to comments will be included as part of the record for consideration by decision makers for the project.

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table ES-1 below summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and resulting level of significance after mitigation for the relevant environmental issue areas evaluated for the project. The table is intended to provide an overview; narrative discussions for the issue areas are included in the corresponding section of this Draft Focused EIR. Table ES-1 is included in the Draft Focused EIR as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(1).

Table ES-1: Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 3.1—Air Quality		
Impact AIR-1: The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact AIR-2: The project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact AIR-3: The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact AIR-4: The project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	**MM AIR-4:** During construction activities, all off-road equipment with engines greater than 50 horsepower shall meet either EPA or ARB Tier IV Interim off-road emission standards. The construction contractor shall maintain records concerning its efforts to comply with this requirement, including equipment lists. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include but are not limited to equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, and engine serial number. If engines that comply with Tier IV Interim off-road emission standards are not commercially available, then the construction contractor shall use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment (e.g., Tier III) available. For purposes of this mitigation measure, "commercially available" shall mean the availability of Tier IV Interim engines taking into consideration factors such as critical-path timing of construction and geographic proximity to the project site of equipment. The contractor can maintain records for equipment that is not commercial available by providing letters from at least two rental companies for each piece of off-road equipment where the Tier IV Interim engine is not available.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact AIR-5: The project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.2—Biological Resources		
Impact BIO-1: The project would potentially have a substantial adverse impact on special-status plant and wildlife species.	**MM-BIO-1: Migratory and Nesting Birds** • Implementation of the following avoidance and minimization measures would avoid or minimize potential effects to migratory birds and habitat in and adjacent to the project site. These measures shall be implemented for construction work during the nesting season (February 15 through August 31): - If construction or tree removal is proposed during the breeding/nesting season for migratory birds (typically February 15 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for northern harrier, and other migratory birds within the construction area, including a 300-foot survey buffer, no more than 3 days prior to the start of ground disturbing activities in the construction area. - If an active nest is located during pre-construction surveys, USFWS and/or CDFW (as appropriate) shall be notified regarding the status of the nest. Furthermore, construction activities shall be restricted as necessary to avoid disturbance of the nest until it is abandoned or a qualified biologist deems disturbance potential to be minimal. Restrictions may include establishment of exclusion zones (no ingress of personnel or equipment at a minimum radius of 300 feet around an active raptor nest and 50-foot radius around an active migratory bird nest) or alteration of the construction schedule. - A qualified biologist shall delineate the buffer using nest buffer signs, Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) fencing, pin flags, and or flagging tape. The buffer zone shall be maintained around the active nest site(s) until the young have fledged and are foraging independently. **MM-BIO-2: Migratory and Nesting Bats** • If suitable roosting habitat for special-status bats will be affected by	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	project construction (e.g., removal or buildings, modification of bridges), a qualified wildlife biologist will conduct surveys for special-status bats during the appropriate time of day to maximize detectability to determine if bat species are roosting near the work area no less than 7 days and no more than 14 days prior to beginning ground disturbance and/or construction. Survey methodology may include visual surveys of bats (e.g., observation of bats during foraging period), inspection for suitable habitat, bat sign (e.g., guano), or use of ultrasonic detectors (Anabat, etc.). Visual surveys will include trees within 0.25 mile of project construction activities. The type of survey will depend on the condition of the potential roosting habitat. If no bat roosts are found, then no further study is required. • If evidence of bat use is observed, the number and species of bats using the roost will be determined. Bat detectors may be used to supplement survey efforts. • If roosts are determined to be present and must be removed, the bats will be excluded from the roosting site before the facility is removed. A mitigation program addressing compensation, exclusion methods, and roost removal procedures will be developed prior to implementation. Exclusion methods may include use of one-way doors at roost entrances (bats may leave but cannot not reenter), or sealing roost entrances when the site can be confirmed to contain no bats. Exclusion efforts may be restricted during periods of sensitive activity (e.g., during hibernation or while females in maternity colonies are nursing young). • If roosts cannot be avoided or it is determined that construction activities may cause roost abandonment, such activities may not commence until permanent, elevated bat houses have been installed outside of, but near the construction area. Placement and height will be determined by a qualified wildlife biologist, but the height of the bat house will be at least 15 feet. Bat houses will be multi-chambered and will be purchased or constructed in accordance with CDFW standards. The number of bat houses required will be dependent upon the size and number of colonies	

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	found, but at least one bat house will be installed for each pair of bats (if occurring individually), or of sufficient number to accommodate each colony of bats to be relocated. **MM-BIO-3: Burrowing Owl Mitigation Measures** To minimize impacts and to adhere to the Western Riverside MSHCP mitigation requirements regarding burrowing owl, it is recommended that: • No more than 30 days prior to the first ground-disturbing activities, the project Applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a preconstruction survey on the project site. The survey shall establish the presence or absence of western burrowing owl and/or habitat features, and evaluate use by owls in accordance with CDFW survey guidelines. • On the parcel where the activity is proposed, the biologist shall survey the proposed disturbance footprint and a 500-foot radius from the perimeter of the proposed footprint to identify burrows and owls. Adjacent parcels under different land ownership need not be surveyed. The survey shall take place near the sunrise or sunset in accordance with CDFW guidelines. All burrows or burrowing owls shall be identified and mapped. During the breeding season (February 1–August 31), surveys shall document whether burrowing owls are nesting on or directly adjacent to disturbance areas. During the non-breeding season (September 1–January 31), surveys shall document whether burrowing owls are using habitat on or directly adjacent to any disturbance area. Survey results will be valid only for the season during which the survey is conducted. • If burrowing owls are not discovered, further mitigation is not required. If burrowing owls are observed during the pre-construction surveys, the applicant shall perform the following measures to limit the impact on the burrowing owls: 1. Avoidance shall include establishment of a 160-foot non-disturbance buffer zone. Construction may occur during the breeding season if a qualified biologist monitors the nest and determines that the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation, or that the juveniles from	

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	the occupied burrows have fledged. During the non-breeding season (September 1-January 31), the project proponent shall avoid the owls and the burrows they are using, if possible. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a 160-foot non-disturbance buffer zone. 2. If it is not possible to avoid occupied burrows, passive relocation shall be implemented. Owls shall be excluded from burrows in the immediate impact zone and within a 160-foot buffer zone by installing one-way doors in burrow entrances. These doors shall be in place for 48 hours prior to excavation. The project area shall be monitored daily for 1 week to confirm that the owl has abandoned the burrow. Whenever possible, burrows should be excavated using hand tools and refilled to prevent re-occupation. Plastic tubing or a similar structure shall be inserted in the tunnels during excavation to maintain an escape route for any owls inside the burrow. Additionally, the Western Riverside MSHCP has specific guidelines that will need to be followed if burrowing owls are found on site. They are as follows: • A focused burrow survey that includes natural burrows or suitable man-made structures needs to be conducted as described below. • A systematic survey for burrows including burrowing owl sign should be conducted by walking through suitable habitat over the entire survey area (i.e. the project site and within 150 meters). Pedestrian survey transects need to be spaced to allow 100 percent visual coverage of the ground surface. • The distance between transect center lines should be no more than 30 meters (approximately 100 feet) and should be reduced to account for differences in terrain, vegetation density, and ground surface visibility. To efficiently survey projects larger than 100 acres, it is recommended that two or more qualified surveyors conduct concurrent surveys. • The location of all suitable burrowing owl habitat, potential owl burrows, burrowing owl sign, and any owls observed should be recorded and mapped, including GPS coordinates. If the survey area contains natural or man-made structures that could potentially support burrowing owls, or	

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	owls are observed during the burrow surveys, the systematic surveys should continue as prescribed in Part B. If no potential burrows are detected, no further surveys are required. A written report including photographs of the project site, location of burrowing owl habitat surveyed, location of transects, and burrow survey methods should be prepared. If the report indicates further surveys are not required, then the report should state the reason(s) why further focused burrowing owl surveys are not necessary. • Focused Burrowing Owl Surveys will consist of site visits on four separate days. The first one may be conducted concurrent with the Focused Burrow Survey. 1. Upon arrival at the survey area and prior to initiating the walking surveys, surveyors using binoculars and/or spotting scopes should scan all suitable habitat, location of mapped burrows, owl sign, and owls, including perch locations to ascertain owl presence. This is particularly important if access has not been granted for adjacent areas with suitable habitat. 2. A survey for owls and owl sign should then be conducted by walking through suitable habitat over the entire project site and within the adjacent 150 m (approximately 500 feet). These "pedestrian surveys" should follow transects (i.e. Survey transects that are spaced to allow 100 percent visual coverage of the ground surface. The distance between transect center lines should be no more than 30 meters (approximately 100 feet.) and should be reduced to account for differences in terrain, vegetation density, and ground surface visibility. To efficiently survey projects larger than 100 acres, it is recommended that two or more qualified surveyors conduct concurrent surveys.) It is important to minimize disturbance near occupied burrows during all seasons. 3. If access is not obtained, then the area adjacent to the project site shall also be surveyed using binoculars and/or spotting scopes to determine if owls are present in areas adjacent to project site. This 150-meter	

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	buffer zone is included to fully characterize the population. If the site is determined not to be occupied, no further surveys are required until 30 days prior to grading (see Pre-construction Surveys below). After completion of appropriate surveys, a final report shall be submitted to the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department and the RCA Monitoring Program Administrator, which discusses the survey methodology, transect width, duration, conditions, and results of the survey. Appropriate maps showing burrow locations shall be included. All project sites containing burrows or suitable habitat (based on Step I/Habitat Assessment) whether owls were found or not, require pre-construction surveys that shall be conducted within 30 days prior to ground disturbance to avoid direct take of burrowing owls (MSHCP Species-Specific Objective 6).	
Impact BIO-2: The project would not have adverse impacts on sensitive natural communities or riparian habitat.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact BIO-3: The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands or jurisdictional features.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact BIO-4: The project would not have substantial adverse impacts on fish or wildlife movement.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact BIO-5: The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	Implement MM BIO-1 through BIO-3.	Less than significant impact.
Impact BIO-6: The project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	Implement MM BIO-1 through BIO-3.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 3.3—Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources		
Impact CUL-1: Subsurface construction activities associated with the project would potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered historic resources.	**MM CUL-1:** If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area shall be halted and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (National Park Service 1983) shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. If necessary, the evaluation may require preparation of a treatment plan and archaeological testing for CRHR eligibility. If the discovery proves to be significant under CEQA and cannot be avoided by the project, additional work such as data recovery excavation may be warranted by the archaeologist to exhaust the data potential of the resource.	Less than significant impact.
Impact CUL-2: Subsurface construction activities associated with the project would potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered archaeological resources.	Implement MM CUL-1a.	Less than significant impact.
Impact CUL-3: Subsurface construction activities associated with the project would potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered paleontological resources.	**MM CUL-3a:** Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a paleontological investigation shall be conducted and a paleontological investigation report shall be submitted to and approved by the County Geologist. The investigation and report shall include, at a minimum, appropriate literature research, personnel interviews as appropriate, site geologic mapping, discussion and description of specific geologic formations/units encountered at the site, and a description of any/all paleontological resources found and/or anticipated to be present at the site. The report shall state the extent and potential significance of the paleontological resources that may exist within the proposed development and provide appropriate measures through which the impacts of the proposed development may be mitigated. In addition, the paleontological consultant shall plot all appropriate geologic and paleontological data on the parent case exhibit and include it as an appendix/figure/plate in their report. **MM CUL-3b:** Prior to the issuance of Grading Permits, the applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist approved by the County of Riverside to	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	create and implement a project-specific plan for monitoring site grading/earthmoving activities (project paleontologist). The project paleontologist retained shall review the approved development plan and grading plan and shall conduct any pre-construction work necessary to render appropriate monitoring and mitigation requirements as appropriate. These requirements shall be documented by the project paleontologist in a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP). This PRIMP shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to issuance of a Grading Permit.	
Impact CUL-4: Subsurface construction activities associated with the project may damage or destroy previously undiscovered human burial sites.	**MM CUL-4:** If human remains are found, State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In accordance with this code, in the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the Riverside County Coroner would be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD would complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and non-destructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.	Less than significant impact.
Impact CUL-5: Subsurface construction activities associated with the project may damage or destroy previously undiscovered tribal cultural resources.	**MM CUL-5:** If tribal cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area would be halted and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (National Park Service 1983) would be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. If necessary, the evaluation may require preparation of a treatment plan and archaeological testing for CRHR eligibility. If the archaeologist determines that the discovery proves to be significant under CEQA and cannot be avoided by the project, additional work such as data recovery excavation may be warranted to exhaust the data potential of the resource. Evaluation process shall be approved by the agency and the Native American representative(s) as identified in during the AB 52 consultation process.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 3.4—Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
Impact GHG-1: The project would not generate direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions that would result in a significant impact on the environment.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact GHG-2: The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.5—Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HYD-1: The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact HYD-2: The project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact HYD-3: The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; (ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; (iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or (iv) impede or redirect flood flows?		
Impact HYD-4: The project would not be located in a flood hazard zone, tsunami, or seiche zone, or risk release of pollutants due to project inundation.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Impact HYD-5: The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.6—Land Use and Planning		
Impact LUP-1: The project would not disrupt or physically divide an established community.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact LUP-2: The project would not 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.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact LUP-3: The project would conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan.	Implementation of MM-BIO-1: Migratory and Nesting Birds. Implementation of MM BIO-2: Migratory and Nesting Bats. Implementation of MM-BIO-3: Burrowing Owl.	Less than significant impact with mitigation measures incorporated.
Section 3.7—Noise		
Impact NOI-1: The project would not potentially expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact NOI-2: The project would not expose persons to generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact NOI-3: The project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact NOI-4: The project would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	**MM NOI-4:** Implementation of the following multi-part mitigation measure is required to reduce potential construction period noise impacts: • The construction contractor shall ensure that all equipment driven by internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. • The construction contractor shall ensure that unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines (i.e., idling in excess of 5 minutes) is prohibited. • The construction contractor shall utilize "quiet" models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists. • At all times during project grading and construction, the construction contractor shall ensure that stationary noise-generating equipment shall be located as far as practicable from sensitive receptors and placed so that emitted noise is directed away from adjacent residences. • The construction contractor shall ensure that the construction staging areas shall be located to create the greatest feasible distance between the staging area and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site. • The construction contractor shall ensure that all on-site construction activities, including the operation of any tools or equipment used in construction, drilling, repair, alteration, grading or demolition work, do not commence between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on week days and between 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. on Saturdays or at any time on a Sunday or federal holidays.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact NOI-5: The project would not expose people residing or working at the project site to excessive noise levels due to its location within an airport land use plan.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Impact NOI-6: The project would not expose people residing or working at the project site to excessive noise levels because of its location within the vicinity of a private airstrip.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Section 3.8—Public Services		
Impact PS-1: The project would not 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 fire protection.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact PS-2: The project would not 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 police protection.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact PS-3: The project would not 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 schools.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact PS-4: The project would not 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 parks.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact PS-5: The project would not 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 other public facilities.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.9—Transportation and Traffic		
Impact TRANS-1: The project would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance 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.	**MM TRANS-1a:** The project will pay a proportional "fair-share" of the improvement costs of the impacted intersections to mitigate the project's traffic impacts. **MM TRANS-1b:** RUSD shall pay a proportional "fair-share" contribution for the installation of a two-phase traffic signal at the Washington Street and Lincoln Avenue intersection. The installation of this improvement is subject to the approval of the City of Riverside. **MM TRANS-1c:** Appropriate school signs and pavement markings shall be installed by RUSD near the project area. Crosswalks at the intersections of Madison Street and Lincoln Avenue and Washington Street and Lincoln Avenue shall be painted yellow to indicate school crossings. SR4-1 signs and SW24-3 signs should be installed in the general vicinity of the yellow asterisks shown in Exhibit 3.9 22 of the TIA. Flashing pedestrian school	Significant and unavoidable impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	crossing signals shall be installed on the west leg of the intersection of Lincoln Avenue/Collingwood street-Project Driveway No. 3. Flashing pedestrian school signal shall be staffed by a crossing guard during the school arrival period and departure period to further ensure that pedestrians can safely cross Lincoln Avenue. **MM TRANS-1d:** Pedestrians travelling northwest/west/southwest of the site should travel towards and along Madison Street to its intersection with Lincoln Avenue. Students then should cross the street within the crosswalks at the intersection of Madison Street/Lincoln Avenue during the traffic signals walk-phase. Consequently, pedestrians travelling northeast/east/southeast of the school should travel towards and along Washington Street to its intersection with Lincoln Avenue. Students should then cross the street within the crosswalks at the intersection of Washington Street/Lincoln Avenue. **MM TRANS-1e:** Sidewalk improvements are to be provided along the easterly boundary of the school parking lot to provide safe student access to the school from the east via t the north side of Lincoln Avenue. **MM TRANS-1f:** Project Drive No. 3 shall be directly aligned (i.e. centerline to centerline) with Collingswood Street to minimize conflicting vehicular movements during final detail design review.	
Impact TRANS-2: The project would not 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.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact TRANS-5: The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	**MM TRANS-5:** Prior to issuance of any grading permits, the developer shall provide a detailed construction traffic control plan to the City of Riverside for approval. A construction traffic control plan shall be prepared for all aspects of project construction, including physical improvements on the site itself, as well as any off-site traffic improvements required to be completed directly by the project applicant. The construction traffic control plan shall describe in detail the location of equipment staging areas, stockpiling/storage areas, construction worker and equipment parking areas, roadways that would be potentially affected, safe detours around the project and/or roadway construction site, as well as provide temporary traffic control (e.g., flag person) and appropriate signage during construction-related truck hauling activities. The traffic control plan shall ensure adequate and uninterrupted access to all nearby residences throughout the construction period. The purpose of these measures is to safely guide motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians, minimize traffic impacts, and ensure the safe and even flow of traffic during construction, consistent with County standards and requirements.	Less than significant impact.
Impact TRANS-6: The project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant impact.