CITY OF RIVERSIDE

COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT **PLANNING DIVISION**

WARD: 3

1. **Case Number:** **PR-2021-000894**

2. **Project Title:** Gas Station and Convenience Store

3. **Hearing Date:** November 19, 2026

4. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside
Community & Economic Development Department
Planning Division
3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Riverside, CA 92522

5. **Contact Person:** Yenifer Cid, Associate Planner
Phone Number: (951) 826-5652

6. **Project Location:** 6902, 6892, and 6836 Arlington Avenue, situated at the southeast corner of Arlington Avenue and Monroe Street.

7. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

Steve Berzansky
PB Arlington
7111 Indiana Avenue, Ste 300
Riverside, CA 92504

8. **General Plan Designation:** The City of Riverside General Plan Land Use Map shows that parcels 191-150-033 and 191-150-032 are designated O – Office while parcel 191-150-031 is designated MU-V – Mixed Use Village.

9. **Zoning:** The City of Riverside Zoning Map shows that parcels 191-150-033 and 191-150-032 are zoned R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential while parcel 191-150-031 is zoned MU-V – Mixed Use Village.

10. **Description of Project:** The 1.3-acre project site consists of three contiguous parcels that are currently vacant and undeveloped. The project requires the following entitlements to facilitate the development of a fueling station with 12 pump stations and a 4,650 square foot convenience store.

Required Entitlements

1. General Plan Amendment: To amend the land use designation on parcels 191-150-033 and 191-150-032 from O – Office to MU-V – Mixed Use Village.

2. Rezone: To change the zone on parcels 191-150-033 and 191-150-032 from R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential to CR – Commercial Retail and parcel 191-150-031 from MU-V – Mixed Use Village to CR – Commercial Retail.

3. Conditional Use Permit: To permit the establishment of a gas station/convenience store with off-sale beer and wine sales in accordance with Table 19.150.020 of the City's Zoning Ordinance.

4. Design Review: Site design and building elevations.

5. Public Convenience and Necessity (PCN): For the off-sale consumption of alcohol from the convenience store. As of this writing, two off-sale licenses are allowed in this census tract per the allotment of the California Department of Beverage Control (ABC). Six off-sale licenses already exist in this census tract, and this establishment would increase that number to seven.

6. Variance (VR): To allow the sale of alcoholic beverages within 1,000 feet of an existing business licensed by the State of California for off-sale general alcoholic beverage with less than 15,000 square feet of gross floor area or that sells alcoholic beverages as its principal business.

Street Improvements
Improvements to Arlington Avenue and Monroe Street, including new pavement and curbs, will be constructed along the frontage of the project.

Circulation
The developer of the Project will be responsible for the dedication and improvements of Arlington Avenue and Monroe Street. Accordingly, the primary entrance of the Project will be along Arlington Avenue, with the secondary entrance / exit along Monroe Street.

Site Drainage
In a post-development state, the site drains to the northwest. Accordingly, a bioretention will be installed on the northwest corner of the site.

Walls/Fences
Noise attenuation will occur with the installation of walls on the south and east property lines.

Landscaping
Approximately 15% of the site is intended to be landscaped, primarily on the south and eastern property lines. All landscaping will be drought resistant and water efficient.

Lighting
Although signage will be approved under a separate permit, all lighting will be downward oriented so as not to disturb the surrounding neighborhood. Additionally, all lighting shall be in compliance with the conditions imposed by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. These conditions include downward shielding, no flashing lights, and the avoidance of certain colors.

Building Design/Architecture. The architecture of the commercial building and the canopies are typical for southern California. The building style can be described as modern. A mix of façade materials and colors will be utilized, including cedar wood, silver corrugated metal panels, and white fiber cement panels. The signage and trim will match the red, orange, white and green corporate colors for 7-Eleven.

Project Design Features

The following Project Design Features (PDFs) would be incorporated into the Project design and constructed or implemented as part of the Project. In general, PDFs are specific design and/or operational characteristics proposed by the Applicant that are incorporated into the Project and part of the Project description. Because PDFs are incorporated into the Project, they do not constitute mitigation measures.

PDF AQ-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the City Engineer shall confirm that the Grading Plan, Building Plans and Specifications require all construction contractors to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) Rules 402 and 403 to minimize construction emissions of dust and particulates. The measures include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Portions of a construction site to remain inactive longer than a period of three months will be seeded and watered until grass cover is grown or otherwise stabilized.
- All on-site roads will be paved as soon as feasible or watered periodically or chemically stabilized.
- All material transported off site will be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation operations will be minimized at all times.
- Where vehicles leave a construction site and enter adjacent public streets, the streets will be swept daily or washed down at the end of the workday to remove soil tracked onto the paved surface.

PDF AQ-2 The applicant shall require by contract specifications that the interior and exterior architectural coatings (paint and primer including parking lot paint) products used would have a volatile organic compound rating of 50 grams per liter or less. Contract specifications shall be included in the construction documents for the Project, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Riverside prior to the issuance of building permits.

PDF AQ-3 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the City Engineer shall confirm that the Grading Plan, Building Plans and Specifications require all construction contractors to incorporate the following measures to minimize construction emissions. These features shall be included in applicable bid documents and included on the grading plans.

- All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower meets California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards or incorporate CARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emission Control Strategy (VDECS) (to reduce PM emissions by at least 85 percent or to achieve PM emissions levels of 0.01 grams per brake-horsepower-hour or less, per Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Sections 2700-2710). Requirements for Tier 4 Final equipment and the option for Level 3 VDECS shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. A copy of each unit's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation (certified tier specification or model year specification), and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be provided to the City at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.
- Construction equipment shall be properly maintained according to manufacturer specifications.
- All diesel-powered construction equipment, delivery vehicles, and delivery trucks shall be turned off when not in use. On-site idling shall be limited to three minutes in any one hour.

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

	Existing Land Use	General Plan Designation	Zoning Designation
Project Site	Undeveloped	O – Office	R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential and C-R – Commercial Retail
North	Business Park, Auto Repair, and Hotel	B/OP – Business / Office Park	AIR – Airport Zone and BMP – Business and Manufacturing Zone
East	Residential	O – Office	R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential
South	Residential	MDR – Medium Density Residential	R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential
West	Residential	MDR – Medium Density Residential	R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential

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

a. Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission – The Riverside Airport Land Use Commission considered the project and approved the Major Land Use Action Review on February 8, 2024.
b. California Department of Alcohol Beverage Control – Following City approval, the Applicant will need to obtain a liquor license, which is anticipated to be a License Type 20 Off-Sale Beer and Wine for the small alcohol sales component.

13. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significant impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB), the City of Riverside sent consultation notices to seven tribal contacts who may have interest in the Project Area: the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California, the Pechanga Band of Indians, Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation, and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. Four tribal contacts requested government-to-government consultations, which occurred in March and April of 2024.

Following the successful government-to-government consultation meetings, mitigation measures were added to this CEQA document to prevent any significant impacts to tribal cultural resources from occurring.

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

a. Riverside General Plan 2025
b. Riverside General Plan 2025 Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2004021108)

15. Acronyms

AICUZ -	Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study
ALUC -	Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
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 -	Greenhouse 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

Appendix List

1. Appendix A: Air Quality Analysis conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026

2. Appendix B: Greenhouse Gas Analysis conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026

3. Appendix C: ~~Focused Health Risk Assessment Technical Report conducted by ESA, dated December 2020 and updated on February 2, 2026~~ Health Risk Assessment Technical Report conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated August 21, 2026

4. Appendix D: Cultural Resources Report conducted by Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc., dated December 14, 2020 and revised on March 20, 2024 and September 5, 2024

5. Appendix E: Noise and Vibration Impact Study conducted by ESA, dated December 2020 and updated on February 2, 2026

6. Appendix F: Traffic Impact Analysis conducted by Trames Solutions, Inc., dated July 29, 2025

7. Appendix G: Geotechnical Report, Preliminary Soil Investigation Report prepared by GeoMat Testing Laboratories, Inc., dated April 24, 2020

8. Appendix H: Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Woodard Group, dated February 15, 2024

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.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture & Forest Resources	☒ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☒ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology/Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Land Use/Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population/Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☒ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities/Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☒ 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 _____

Printed Name & Title _____ For _____

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 with in 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. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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)***

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project consists of an infill project within an urbanized area completely surrounded by existing development where there are no scenic vistas. Therefore, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic view, and direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to scenic vistas are **less than significant impacts**.

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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)***

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 or within view of 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 resources within a scenic roadway. As well, there are no rock outcroppings or historic buildings within view of this proposed project so no impacts to these resources are expected. Lastly, the Zoning Code regulates building setbacks, building heights, land uses, landscaping, parking and other development standards for use and development of all properties. This Project complies with these standards. Therefore, the Project would not damage scenic resources and **no impact** would occur.

c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly-accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒

1c. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Zoning Code, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)***

No Impact. The proposed project consists of an infill project within an urbanized area completely surrounded by existing development, or is in a non-urbanized area where public views will not be degraded. The project has been designed to be compatible with the surrounding area. The project does not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations regarding scenic quality. Therefore, it will not degrade the existing visual character of the area and **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the visual character or quality of the Planning Area will occur.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

1d. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-2 – Mount Palomar Lighting Area, Riverside Municipal Code Title 19 – Article VIII – Chapter 19.556 – Lighting, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)***

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Less Than Significant Impact. As the proposed Project would create a new development on a currently vacant property, new sources of light from street lights, commercial signage, and commercial parking lots would be introduced into the area and all will contribute to light and glare and affect the nighttime sky. All new lighting would be focused on the Project site to prevent spillover onto surrounding areas. Additionally, the project has been designed in accordance with the City's lighting requirements. Adherence to existing regulations would ensure that impacts related to light and glare would be **less than significant**.				
2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:				
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 complied 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:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
2a. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability)***				
No Impact. The Project is located within an urbanized area. A review of Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability of the General Plan 2025 reveals that the project site is not designated as, and is not adjacent to or in proximity to any land classified as, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to agricultural uses.				
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
2b. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-3 - Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Figure 5.2-2 – Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Figure 5.2-4 – Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural Uses, and Riverside Municipal Code Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.150 – Base Zones and Permitted Land Uses)***				
No Impact. The project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. A review of Figure 5.2-2 – Williamson Act Preserves of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR and Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves of the General Plan 2025 reveals that the project site is not located within an area that is affected by a Williamson Act *Preserve* or under a Williamson Act contract. Moreover, the project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not next to land zoned for agricultural use. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, and **no impact** would occur.				

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

2c. Response: ***(Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)***

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.

Note:

Public Resources Code section 12220(g). *"Forest land" is land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species,* including *hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.*

Government Code Section 51104(g). "Timberland production zone" or "TPZ" means an area which has been zoned pursuant to Section 51112 or 51113 and is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting timber and compatible uses, as defined in subdivision (h).

With respect to the general plans of cities and counties, "timberland preserve zone" means "timberland production zone."

(h) "Compatible use" is any use which does not significantly detract from the use of the property for, or inhibit, growing and harvesting timber, and shall include, but not be limited to, any of the following, unless in a specific instance such as use would be contrary to the preceding definition to compatible use:

(1) Management for watershed
(2) Management for fish and wildlife habitat or hunting and fishing.
(3) A use integrally related to the growing, harvesting and processing of forest products, including but not limited to roads, log landings, and log storage areas.
(4) The erection, construction, alteration, or maintenance of gas, electric, water, or communication transmission facilities.
(5) Grazing.
(6) A residence or other structure necessary for the management of land zoned as timberland production.

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

2d. Response: ***(Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)***

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.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

2e. Response: (*Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves)*

No Impact. The project is located in an urbanized area of the City. Additionally, the site is identified as urban/built-out land and therefore 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

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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.				
3. AIR QUALITY.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3a. Response: ***(Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2022 ~~2016~~ Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP); Appendix A – Air Quality Assessment conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026)***

Less Than Significant Impact. The currently applicable air quality plan is the 2022 ~~2016~~ Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which was developed in conjunction with regional growth projections incorporated into the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2020 ~~2016~~ Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG's modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the SCAQMD's AQMP, Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TRIP), and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 "Typical Growth Scenario." Since the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, it is also consistent with the AQMP. The project's construction and operation will have a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.

b. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3b. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2022 ~~2007~~ Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod 2022 ~~2007~~ Model, EMFAC 2021 ~~2007~~ Model, Appendix A – Air Quality Assessment conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026), and Appendix B – Greenhouse Gas Analysis conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026)***

Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction Emissions. The construction-related emissions associated with the project would generate short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants. The criteria pollutants of primary concern within the project area include O_3-precursor pollutants (i.e. ROG and NO_X) and PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Construction results in the temporary generation of emissions resulting from site grading, road paving, motor vehicle exhaust associated with construction equipment and worker trips, and the movement of construction equipment, especially on unpaved surfaces. Emissions of airborne particulate matter are largely dependent on the amount of ground disturbance associated with site preparation activities as well as weather conditions and the appropriate application of water.

The project's construction is estimated to last approximately 14 ~~12~~ months. Construction-related emissions associated the project were calculated using the CARB-approved CalEEMod computer program, which is designed to model emissions for land use development projects, based on typical construction requirements. The maximum daily

construction-generated emissions predicted for the project are summarized in **Table 1: Construction-Related Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day**.

Fugitive dust emissions may ~~can also~~ have a substantial, temporary impact on local air quality. In addition, fugitive dust may be a nuisance to those living and working in the Project vicinity. Uncontrolled dust from construction can become a nuisance and potential health hazard to those living and working nearby. SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403 (prohibition of nuisances, watering of inactive and perimeter areas, track out requirements, etc.), are applicable to the project and were applied in CalEEMod to minimize fugitive dust emissions. ~~Standard Condition (SC)~~ Project Design Feature (PDF) AQ-1 requires the implementation of Rule 402 and 403 dust control techniques to minimize PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations.

Rule 1113 provides specifications on painting practices and regulates the ROG content of paint. As required by law, all architectural coatings for the Project structures would comply with SCAQMD Rule 1113. **Table 1: Construction-Related Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day** shows that Project construction would not exceed ROG thresholds with the implementation of ~~SC~~ PDF AQ-2, which limits the VOC content of paint to 50 grams per liter or less. Construction ROG emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds.

Table 1: Construction-Related Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day

Construction Year	Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	Nitrogen Oxide (NO_x)	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	Coarse Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)
2026 ~~2021 Construction~~	1.47 ~~1.94~~	12.90 ~~17.44~~	14.75 ~~13.76~~	0.02 ~~0.03~~	2.55 ~~3.33~~	1.45 ~~1.99~~
2027 ~~2022 Construction~~	5.80 ~~7.07~~	8.28 ~~13.34~~	10.01 ~~13.52~~	0.02 ~~0.03~~	0.33 ~~0.89~~	0.25 ~~0.65~~
Maximum Emissions	**5.80**	**12.90**	**14.75**	**0.02**	**2.55**	**1.45**
SCAQMD Threshold	*75*	*100*	*550*	*150*	*55*	*150*
Exceed SCAQMD Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Notes: SCAQMD Rule 403 Fugitive Dust applied. The Rule 403 reduction/credits include the following: properly maintain mobile and other construction equipment; replace ground cover in disturbed areas quickly; water exposed surfaces three times daily; cover stock piles with tarps; water all haul roads twice daily; and limit speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour. Reductions percentages from the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook (Tables XI-A through XI-E) were applied. No mitigation was applied to construction equipment. Refer to Appendix A – Air Quality Analysis conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026, *Appendix A* for Model Data Outputs.
Source: CalEEMod version ~~2016.3.2.~~ 2022.1. Refer to Appendix A – Air Quality Analysis conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026, *Appendix A* for Model Data Outputs.

As shown in **Table 1: Construction-Related Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day**, all criteria pollutant emissions would remain below their respective thresholds. While impacts would be considered **less than significant**, the Project would be subject to SCAQMD Rules 402, 403, and 1113 as well as ~~SC~~ PDF AQ-1 and ~~SC~~ PDF AQ-2. The proposed Project construction emissions would not worsen ambient air quality, create additional violations of federal and State standards, or delay SCAB's goal for meeting attainment standards.

Operational Emissions. Project-generated emissions would be primarily associated with motor vehicle use and area sources, such as the use of landscape maintenance equipment and architectural coatings. Long-term operational emissions attributable to the Project are summarized in **Table 2: Long-Term Operational Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day**. Each of these sources are described below.

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

Table 2: Long-Term Operational Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day

Source	Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	Nitrogen Oxide (NO_x)	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	Coarse Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)
Area Source Emissions	0.15	0.00	0.20 ~~0.00~~	<0.01 ~~0.00~~	<0.01 ~~0.00~~	<0.01 ~~0.00~~
Energy Emissions	0.00	0.02 ~~0.09~~	0.02 ~~0.07~~	<0.01 ~~0.00~~	<0.01 ~~0.00~~	<0.01 ~~0.00~~
Mobile Emissions	3.12 ~~4.8~~	3.12 ~~37.10~~	29.74 ~~30.62~~	0.08 ~~0.11~~	7.03 ~~6.07~~	1.82 ~~1.67~~
Gas Dispensing Facility	10.65	0	0	0	0	0
Total Emissions	**13.92 ~~4.95~~**	**3.15 ~~37.19~~**	**29.96 ~~30.69~~**	**0.08 ~~0.11~~**	**7.03 ~~6.07~~**	**1.82 ~~1.67~~**
SCAQMD Threshold	*55*	*55*	*550*	*150*	*150*	*55*
Exceeds Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: CalEEMod version ~~2016.3.2~~ 2022.1. Refer to Appendix A – Air Quality Analysis conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026, *Appendix A* for Model Data Outputs.

- **Area Source Emissions.** Area source emissions would be generated due to on-site equipment, architectural coating, and landscaping that were previously not present on the site.
- **Energy Source Emissions.** Energy source emissions would be generated due to electricity and natural gas usage associated with the Project. Primary uses of electricity and natural gas by the project would be for space heating and cooling, water heating, ventilation, lighting, appliances, and electronics.
- **Mobile Source.** Mobile sources are emissions from motor vehicles, including tailpipe and evaporative emissions. Depending upon the pollutant being discussed, the potential air quality impact may be of either regional or local concern. For example, ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ are all pollutants of regional concern. NO_X and ROG react with sunlight to form O_3, known as photochemical smog. Additionally, wind currents readily transport PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. However, CO tends to be a localized pollutant, dispersing rapidly at the source. Project-generated vehicle emissions are based on the trip generation within the Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix F) and incorporated into CalEEMod as recommended by the SCAQMD.
- **Gas Dispensing Facility.** The proposed project includes twelve vehicle fueling positions. The twelve vehicle fueling positions would dispense gasoline and therefore would be considered a gasoline dispensing facility (GDF). GDFs are regulated by the SCAQMD, and GDFs require permits from the SCAQMD. Thus, emissions attributed to the GDF were estimated separately from the area source operational emissions above. The emissions calculations are based on a maximum daily throughput of 12,672 gallons of gasoline (approximately 4.63 million gallons per year). In addition to traffic-related emissions, the GDF is also a source of ROG emissions associated with loading, storage, refueling of vehicles and spillage that results in evaporative emissions. **Table 2: Long-Term Operational Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day** also presents the evaporative ROG emissions associated with the proposed GDF.

As shown in **Table 2: Long-Term Operational Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day,** Project emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for any criteria air pollutants. Therefore, long-term operations emissions would result in a **less than significant impact**.

Cumulative Short-Term Emissions

The SCAB is designated nonattainment for O_3, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ for State standards and nonattainment for O_3 and $PM_{2.5}$ for Federal standards. Appendix D of the SCAQMD White Paper on Potential Control Strategies to Address Cumulative Impacts from Air Pollution (2003) notes that projects that result in emissions that do not exceed the project-specific SCAQMD regional thresholds of significance should result in a less than significant impact on a

cumulative basis unless there is other pertinent information to the contrary. The mass-based regional significance thresholds published by the SCAQMD are designed to ensure compliance with both NAAQS and CAAQS and are based on an inventory of projected emissions in the SCAB. Therefore, if a project is estimated to result in emissions that do not exceed the thresholds, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact on air quality in the SCAB would not be cumulatively considerable. As shown in **Table 1: Construction-Related Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day** above, Project construction-related emissions by themselves would not exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for criteria pollutants. Therefore, the proposed Project would not generate a cumulatively considerable contribution to air pollutant emissions during construction.

The SCAQMD has developed strategies to reduce criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the AQMP pursuant to the FCAA mandates. The analysis assumed fugitive dust controls would be utilized during construction, including frequent water applications. SCAQMD rules, mandates, and compliance with adopted AQMP emissions control measures would also be imposed on construction projects throughout the SCAB, which would include related projects. Compliance with SCAQMD rules and regulations would further reduce the Project construction-related impacts. Therefore, project-related construction emissions, combined with those from other projects in the area, would not substantially deteriorate local air quality. Construction emissions associated with the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative air quality impacts.

Cumulative Long-Term Impacts

The SCAQMD has not established separate significance thresholds for cumulative operational emissions. The nature of air emissions is largely a cumulative impact. As a result, no single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, individual project emissions contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. The SCAQMD developed the operational thresholds of significance based on the level above which individual project emissions would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the SCAB's existing air quality conditions. Therefore, a project that exceeds the SCAQMD operational thresholds would also be a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

As shown in **Table 2: Long-Term Operational Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day**, the proposed Project operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds. As a result, operational emissions associated with the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative air quality impacts. Additionally, adherence to SCAQMD rules and regulations would alleviate potential impacts related to cumulative conditions on a project-by-project basis. Project operations would not contribute a cumulatively considerable net increase of any nonattainment criteria pollutant.

Standard Conditions and Requirements:

~~SC~~ **PDF AQ-1**: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the City Engineer shall confirm that the Grading Plan, Building Plans and Specifications require all construction contractors to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) Rules 402 and 403 to minimize construction emissions of dust and particulates. The measures include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Portions of a construction site to remain inactive longer than a period of three months will be seeded and watered until grass cover is grown or otherwise stabilized.
- All on-site roads will be paved as soon as feasible or watered periodically or chemically stabilized.
- All material transported off site will be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation operations will be minimized at all times.
- Where vehicles leave a construction site and enter adjacent public streets, the streets will be swept daily or washed down at the end of the workday to remove soil tracked onto the paved surface.

~~SC~~ **PDF AQ-2**: The applicant shall require by contract specifications that the interior and exterior architectural coatings (paint and primer including parking lot paint) products used would have a volatile organic compound rating

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
of 50 grams per liter or less. Contract specifications shall be included in the construction documents for the project, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Riverside prior to the issuance of building permits.				
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☒	☒	☐

3c. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2022 ~~2016~~ Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod, EMFAC 2021 ~~2017~~ Model, Appendix A – Air Quality Assessment conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026, Appendix B – Greenhouse Gas Analysis conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026, and Appendix C – Health Risk Assessment conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated August 21, 2026)***

Less Than Significant Impact with PDF AQ-3 incorporated.

Short-term impacts associated with construction from General Plan 2025 typical build out will result in increased air emissions from grading, earthmoving, and 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., watering for dust control, tuning equipment, limiting truck idling times).

Sensitive populations are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than is the general population. Sensitive receptors that are in proximity to localized sources of toxics are of particular concern. Land uses considered sensitive receptors include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, and retirement homes. The nearest sensitive receptors ~~Sensitive land uses~~ surrounding the Project are single-family residential homes located adjacent to the east and south of the Project ~~consist mostly of single family residential communities~~. Sensitive land uses nearest to the Project are shown in **Table 3: Sensitive Receptors.**

Table 3: Sensitive Receptors.

Receptor Description	Distance and Direction from the Project[1]
Motel	95 feet to the north
Motel	180 feet to the northeast
Single-Family Residences	Adjacent to the south ~~east~~
Single-Family Residences	Adjacent to the east ~~20 feet to the south~~
Single-Family Residences	90 ~~110~~ feet to the west

1. Distance measured from the Project site to the receiver property line.

The nearest sensitive receptors are residences ~~residential houses~~ located adjacent to the east and south of the proposed project. To identify impacts to sensitive receptors, the SCAQMD recommends addressing LSTs for construction. LSTs were developed in response to SCAQMD Governing Boards' Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative (I-4). The SCAQMD provided the *Final* Localized *Significance Threshold Methodology* (dated June 2003 [revised 2008]) for guidance. The LST methodology assists lead agencies in analyzing localized impacts associated with Project-specific emissions.

Since CalEEMod calculates construction emissions based on the number of equipment hours and the maximum daily soil disturbance activity possible for each piece of equipment, **Table 4: Equipment- Specific Grading Rates**, is used to determine the maximum daily disturbed acreage for comparison to LSTs. The appropriate SRA for the localized significance thresholds is the Metropolitan Riverside County (SRA 23) since this area includes the Project. LSTs apply to CO, NO_2, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. The SCAQMD produced look-up tables for projects that disturb areas less than or equal to 5 acres in size. Project construction is anticipated to disturb a maximum of 1 acre in a single day. As the LST guidance provides thresholds for projects disturbing 1-, 2-, and 5-acres in size and the thresholds increase with size of the site, the LSTs for a 1.5-acre threshold were interpolated and utilized for this analysis.

Table 4: Equipment-Specific Grading Rates

Construction Phase	Equipment Type	Equipment Quantity	Acres Graded per 8-hour Day	Operating House per Day	Acres Graded per Day
Site Preparation	Tractors	0 ~~1~~	0.5	8	0 ~~0.5~~
	Graders	1	0.5	8	0.5
	Dozers	1	0.5	8	0.5
	Scrapers	0	1	8	0
			Total Acres Graded per Day		**1 ~~1.5~~**

Source: CalEEMod version 2022.1 ~~2016.3.2~~

The SCAQMD's methodology states that "off-site mobile emissions from the proposed project should not be included in the emissions compared to LSTs." Therefore, only emissions included in the CalEEMod "on- site" emissions outputs were considered. The nearest sensitive receptors are residential houses located adjacent to the east of the Project. LST thresholds are provided for distances to sensitive receptors of 25, 50, 100, 200, and 500 meters. Therefore, LSTs for 25 meters were utilized in this analysis. **Table 5: Localized Significance of Construction Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day**, shows the results of localized emissions during construction. This table represents the worst-case scenario and are based on peak earthwork volumes anticipated.

Table 5: Localized Significance of Construction Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day

Construction Activity	Nitrogen Oxide (NOx)	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Coarse Particulate Matter (PM10)	Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)
Site Preparation (2026 ~~2021~~)	11.04 ~~17.42~~	11.72 ~~7.56~~	2.14 ~~3.24~~	1.25 ~~1.97~~
Grading (2026 ~~2021~~)	12.86 ~~14.33~~	14.03 ~~6.33~~	2.42 ~~2.74~~	1.42 ~~1.67~~
Building Construction (2026 ~~2021~~)	8.57 ~~13.64~~	9.96 ~~12.90~~	0.29 ~~0.68~~	0.27 ~~0.66~~
Building Construction (2027 ~~2022~~)	8.25 ~~12.50~~	9.91 ~~12.73~~	0.26 ~~0.59~~	0.24 ~~0.57~~
Paving (2027 ~~2022~~)	4.30 ~~6.77~~	6.49 ~~8.81~~	0.17 ~~0.35~~	0.16 ~~0.32~~
Architectural Coating (2027 ~~2022~~)	0.83 ~~1.41~~	1.13 ~~1.81~~	0.02 ~~0.08~~	0.02 ~~0.08~~
Maximum Emissions	*12.86*	*14.03*	*2.42*	*1.41*
SCAQMD Localized Screening Threshold (adjusted for 1 acres at 25 meters)	*118 ~~275~~*	*602 ~~1,230~~*	*4 ~~10~~*	*3 ~~6~~*
Exceed SCAQMD Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Table 5: Localized Significance of Construction Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day shows that emissions of these pollutants would not result in significant concentrations of pollutants at nearby sensitive receptors. Significant impacts would not occur concerning LSTs during construction.

Localized Operational Significance Analysis

According to the SCAQMD localized significance threshold methodology, operational LSTs apply to onsite sources. As the nearest receptors are located adjacent to the Project site, LSTs for 25 meters for SRA 23 were used in this analysis. The 1-acre operational LST threshold was used for approximately 1.3-acre Project site. As the LSTs increase with size of the site, the 1-acre LSTs are conservative for evaluation of a 1.3-acre site. The on-site operational emissions were calculated using CalEEMod and are compared to the LST thresholds in **Table 6: Localized Significance of Operational Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day**. The operational emissions

shown in **Table 6: Localized Significance of Operational Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day** include all on-site project-related stationary sources (i.e., area and energy sources). **Table 6: Localized Significance of Operational Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day** shows that the project would not generate localized emissions during project operations. Therefore, the project would result in a **less than significant impact** concerning LSTs during operational activities.

Table 6: Localized Significance of Operational Emissions in Maximum Pounds per Day

Construction Activity	Nitrogen Oxide (NOx)	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Coarse Particulate Matter (PM10)	Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)
On-Site Emissions	0.02 ~~0.09~~	0.22 ~~0.07~~	<0.01 ~~0.00~~	<0.01 ~~0.00~~
SCAQMD Localized Screening Threshold (adjusted for 1 acres at 25 meters)	*118* ~~*147*~~	*602*	*1*	*1*
Exceed SCAQMD Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

1. SRA Zone 23 – Metropolitan Riverside County; 1-acre area, 25 meters to receptor.
Source: CalEEMod version 2022.1 ~~2016.3.2~~. Refer to Appendix A for model outputs.

In conformance with the General Plan 2025 FPEIR MM-AIR-1 and MM-AIR-7, CalEEMod computer model analyzed short-term construction and long-term operational related impacts of the project and determined that the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for short-term construction and long-term operational impacts. 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.

Construction and Operational Health Risk Assessment

A project-specific Health Risk Assessment (HRA) was prepared to evaluate potential health risks associated with toxic air contaminants (TACs) generated by construction and operation of the proposed project. The HRA was conducted in accordance with SCAQMD guidance and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) Air Toxics Program Guidance Manual, and is provided as Appendix C.

Project construction would generate DPM emissions from the use of required off-road diesel equipment. The amount receptors are exposed (a function of concentration and duration of exposure) is the primary factor used to determine health risk (i.e., potential exposure to TAC emission levels that exceed applicable standards). PM_{10} construction emissions rates in grams per second were calculated from the total annual on-site construction exhaust emissions reported in CalEEMod. Maximum (worst case) PM_{10} construction exhaust emissions over the entire construction period were used in AERMOD, a U.S. EPA-approved dispersion model, to approximate construction DPM emissions. Risk levels were calculated based on the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) guidance document, *Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines* (February 2015). SCAQMD's threshold for cancer risk is 10-in-one-million and the acute or chronic noncancer hazard index is one. Projects that do not exceed these thresholds would not result in a significant impact.

The project HRA (see Appendix C) determined that unmitigated construction would be 16.77 in one million, which would exceed the 10 in one million threshold. Therefore, **PDF AQ-3** is required to ensure the project uses low DPM emitting construction equipment. **PDF AQ-3** ensures that any diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower will use Tier 4 engines or incorporate CARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy, equipment will be properly maintained, and truck idling will be kept to a minimum to reduce DPM emissions. The HRA shows that **PDF AQ-3** would reduce construction health risk to 3.16 in one million, which is below the 10 in one million threshold. Therefore, with **PDF AQ-3** construction health risk impacts would be less than significant.

An operational phase HRA was also conducted for the proposed project. The HRA evaluated potential impacts to the maximally exposed residential receptors from toxic organic gas (TOG), primarily benzene, generated during

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

project operations. Operational TAC emissions from fuel storage and dispensing were calculated using CARB and CAPCOA-recommended emission factors. Air dispersion modeling was performed using the AERMOD model with five years of site-representative meteorological data, consistent with SCAQMD modeling guidance. Operational TAC emissions associated with the proposed gasoline station would result in a maximum individual cancer risk of 4.31 in on million, which is below the 10 in one million threshold without mitigation. Operational health risks would be less than significant.

In addition, combined construction and operational cancer risk, with mitigation applied to construction activities, would remain below the SCAQMD significance threshold. The analysis also determined that chronic and acute non-cancer hazard indices from both construction and operational TAC emissions would be well below the threshold of 1.0. As described above, based on the results of the HRA, and with implementation of **PDF AQ-3**, project toxic air contaminant-related health impacts would be less than significant.

PDF AQ-3 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the City Engineer shall confirm that the Grading Plan, Building Plans and Specifications require all construction contractors to incorporate the following measures to minimize construction emissions. These features shall be included in applicable bid documents and included on the grading plans.

- All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower meets California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards or incorporate CARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emission Control Strategy (VDECS) (to reduce PM emissions by at least 85 percent or to achieve PM emissions levels of 0.01 grams per brake-horsepower-hour or less, per Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Sections 2700-2710). Requirements for Tier 4 Final equipment and the option for Level 3 VDECS shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. A copy of each unit's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation (certified tier specification or model year specification), and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be provided to the City at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.
- Construction equipment shall be properly maintained according to manufacturer specifications.
- All diesel-powered construction equipment, delivery vehicles, and delivery trucks shall be turned off when not in use. On-site idling shall be limited to three minutes in any one hour.

d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3d. Response: ***(Source: Appendix A – Air Quality Analysis conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026 and Appendix B – Greenhouse Gas Analysis conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026)***

Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction

Odors that could be generated by construction activities are required to follow SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent odor nuisances on sensitive land uses. SCAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance, states:

A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
During construction-related activities, some odors (not substantial pollutant concentrations) that may be detected are those typical of construction vehicles (e.g. diesel exhaust from grading and construction equipment). These odors are a temporary short-term impact that is typical of construction projects, are not expected to affect a substantial number of people and would disperse rapidly. Furthermore, odors that could be generated by construction activities are required to follow SCAQMD Rule 402 (Nuisance) to prevent odor nuisances on sensitive land uses. Therefore, impacts related to odors associated with the Project's construction-related activities would **be less than significant**. **Operational** The SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* identifies certain land uses as sources of odors. These land uses include agriculture (farming and livestock), wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting facilities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The project would not include any of the land uses that have been identified by the SCAQMD as odor sources. Therefore, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors and operational impacts would be **less than significant** related to the emissions of odors and other potential nuisance conditions.				
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4a. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserves 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)*** **No Impact.** The project site is located on a previously developed/improved 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, suitable habitat for such species on site. 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. 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.				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4b. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserves 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)***				

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 on a previously developed/improved 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.				
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4c. Response: ***(Source: City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS Quad Map Layer)***				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4d. Response: ***(Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages)***				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4e. Response: ***(Source: MSHCP, Riverside Municipal Code – Title 16 – Chapter 16.72 – Section 16.72.040 – Establishment of the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Fee, Title 16 – Chapter 16.40 – Section 16.40.040 – Establishment of a Threatened and Endangered Species Preservation Development Fees, City of Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual)***				
No Impact. The construction of the fueling station and convenience store, is subject to MSHCP mitigation fees, City of Riverside landscaping design standards, and all applicable regional, State and Federal conservation, endangered and threatened species mitigation fees. In addition, 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. This project has been reviewed for compliance with these policies and found to be in compliance with these policies. For these reasons, the project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4f. Response: ***(Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserves and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan)*** **No Impact.** The project site is located on a previously developed/improved 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 pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	☐	☐	☐	☒
5a. Response: ***(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code, and Appendix D – Cultural Resources Report prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates on December 14, 2020 and revised on March 20, 2024 and September 5, 2024)*** **No Impact.** "Historical Resources: are defined by CEQA as a resource that meets one or more of the following criteria: (1) is listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); (2) is listed in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5020.1(k); (3) is identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g); or (4) is determined to be a historical resource by a project's Lead Agency (PRC Section 21084.1 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[a]). A "substantial adverse change" to a historical resource, according to PRC Section 5020.1(q), "means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of a historical resource would be impaired." A Cultural Resources Report (*see* Appendix D to this Initial Study) was prepared for the project site, which concluded that the proposed project will not result in any direct impacts to any cultural resources. The project is located on a site where no historic resources exist as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines because the project currently is undeveloped. However, there were two homes on the site that were removed by the year 2000. No physical evidence remains of those houses at this time. Therefore, **no impacts** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to historical resources are expected.				
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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 Report prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates on December 14, 2020 and revised on March 20, 2024 and September 5, 2024)*** **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**. Appendix D – Cultural Resources Report determined that there are no previously documented archaeological resources that are present on-site. However, the Project Site could have unknown subsurface resources, and project-related construction could uncover previously undiscovered archaeological resources during earth-moving activities. Per Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB), the City of Riverside sent consultation notices to seven tribal contacts who may have interest in the Project Area: the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California, the Pechanga Band of Indians, Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation, and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. Four tribal contacts requested government-to-government consultations, which occurred in March and April of 2024. The City sent final memorandums to each organization on May 7, 2024,				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
to confirm concurrence with implementing Mitigation Measures MM CUL-1 through MM CUL-4 to minimize impacts to tribal cultural resources, including archaeological resources. Additionally, as a Standard Condition of Approval, the Project would comply with State Law and adhere to the required procedures outlined in the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code in the event that human remains are encountered. For additional analysis, please see Section 18 – Tribal Cultural Resources. Therefore, the project will, with mitigation, have a **less than significant impact** on archaeological resources.				
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐
5c. Response: ***(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Cultural Resource Report prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates on December 14, 2020 and revised on March 20, 2024 and September 5, 2024)*** **Less Than Significant.** No dedicated cemetery exists on or within the vicinity of the Project Site. It is not anticipated that intact human remains would be encountered during construction activities. However, in the event that human remains are encountered, those remains would require proper treatment, in accordance with the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. As required by State law, the requirements and procedures set forth in Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code would also be implemented. With adherence to existing State laws and the Standard Condition of Approval outlined in Section 18 – Tribal Cultural Resources below, impacts related to the disturbance of any previously unknown human remains would be **less than significant**.				
6. ENERGY Would the project:				
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
6a. Response: **Less than Significant.** **Construction** Construction of the project will comply with standard local regulations and current building codes which affect such things as noise, energy efficiency, and recycling. Compliance with these regulations and codes will mean that impacts to energy consumption from the project will remain **less than significant**. **Operational** The operation of the end users of the project site will be subject to annual inspections from the local fire department, county Environmental Health Department, and state regulators. These inspections will ensure that such issues as fuel storage safety, working modern appliances, and efficient disposal of waste and recyclables are addressed. Therefore, compliance with current standard practices will ensure that the project will have a **less than significant** impact on energy resources.				
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐
6b. Response: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would be designed to comply with the California Green Building Standards Code; Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations; California Building Code and Energy				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Code standards, as applicable to the type of use being developed on site. The proposed Project would also comply with measures that are presented in the Riverside Economic Prosperity Action Plan and Climate Action Plan January 2016 by implementing different design elements that increase energy efficiency. The measures and how the Project will comply are presented below: • **Measure E-2: Shade Trees**. The applicant of the proposed project has prepared a Landscape Plan for the site, which includes shade trees in various locations where residential units would be located. • **Measure SR-3: Utility Programs.** The proposed Project would be designed to support the City's utility programs to promote energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy. • **Measure W-1: Water Conservation and Efficiency.** The proposed Project would comply with the California Green Building Standards Code through implementation of fixture flow rates, standards for plumbing fixtures and fittings, and automatic irrigation systems utilizing weather and/or soil moisture-based irrigation controllers. Based on the Project design features incorporated into the Project, the proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan related to renewable energy or energy efficiency. Direct, indirect, or cumulative Project impacts would be **less than significant**.				
7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a. Directly or indirectly cause 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.	☐	☐	☐	☒
7i. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones & General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Appendix G – Geotechnical Report, Preliminary Soil Investigation Report prepared by GeoMat Testing Laboratories, Inc. on April 24, 2020)*** **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 regulations will ensure that **no impacts** related to strong seismic ground will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively.				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
7ii. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Appendix G – Geotechnical Report, Preliminary Soil Investigation Report prepared by GeoMat Testing Laboratories, Inc. on April 24, 2020)*** **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 regulations, impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking will have **no impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7iii. 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 G – Geotechnical Report, Preliminary Soil Investigation Report prepared by GeoMat Testing Laboratories, Inc. on April 24, 2020)*** **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located in an area with a high potential for liquefaction. A geotechnical study has been prepared to determine the soil properties and specific potential for liquefaction for the proposed development. Incorporation of the recommended design measures of the Preliminary Soil Investigation Report (Appendix G) for compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, are reduced to **less than significant impact** levels directly, indirectly and cumulatively.				
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
7iv. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Appendix G – Geotechnical Report, Preliminary Soil Investigation Report prepared by GeoMat Testing Laboratories, Inc. on April 24, 2020, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, and Appendix H – Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan conducted by Woodard Group, dated February 15, 2024)*** **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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
7b. 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, and Appendix H – Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan conducted by Woodard Group, dated February 15, 2024)*** **Less Than Significant Impact.** Erosion and loss of topsoil could occur as a result of the project. State and Federal requirements call for the preparation and implementation of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) establishing erosion and sediment controls for construction activities. The project must also comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations. In addition, with the erosion control standards for which all development activity must comply (Title 18), the Grading Code (Title 17) also requires the implementation of measures designed to minimize soil erosion. Compliance with State and Federal requirements as well as with Titles 18 and 17 will ensure that soil erosion or loss of topsoil will be **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
7c. 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 G – Geotechnical Report, Preliminary Soil Investigation Report prepared by GeoMat Testing Laboratories, Inc. on April 24, 2020)*** **Less Than Significant Impact.** The general topography of the subject site is generally flat. Compliance with the City's existing codes and the policies contained in the General Plan 2025 help to ensure that impacts related to geologic conditions are reduced to less **than significant impacts** level directly, indirectly and cumulatively. Landslides: See response 6 a iv. Lateral spreading: Adherence to the City's Grading and Subdivision Codes as well as the California Building Code in the design of this project will prevent lateral spreading.				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Subsidence: The Preliminary Soil Investigation (Appendix G) prepared for this project indicates that the soil properties of the subject site do not have the potential for subsidence. Liquefaction: See response 6 a iii. Collapse: Adherence to the City's grading and building requirements will ensure that the property is adequately prepared to prevent the collapse of the graded pad.				
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
7d. 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 G – Geotechnical Report, Preliminary Soil Investigation Report prepared by GeoMat Testing Laboratories, Inc. on April 24, 2020, and California Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code)*** **Less Than Significant Impact.** Expansive soil is defined under *California Building Code*. The soil type of the subject site is clayey sands. The Preliminary Soil Investigation Report (Appendix G) prepared for this project indicates that the soil is not an expansive soil. Compliance with the recommendations of the soils report and applicable provisions of the City's Subdivision Code- Title 18 and the California Building Code with regard to soil hazards related to the expansive soils will be reduced to a **less than significant impact** level for this project directly, indirectly and cumulatively.				
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒
7e. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types)*** **No Impact.** The proposed project will be served by sewer infrastructure. Therefore, the project will have **no impact.**				
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐
7f. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3, Appendix D – Cultural Resources Report prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates dated December 14, 2020 and revised on March 20, 2024 and September 5, 2024)*** **Less than Significant Impact.** Activities including construction-related and earth-disturbing actions, could damage or destroy fossils in rock units. As with archaeological resources, paleontological resources are generally considered to be historical resources, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(3)(D). Consequently, damage or destruction to these resources could cause a significant impact. A cultural resources survey prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates on December 14, 2020 has determined that the proposed project is consistent with general Plan Policy HP-1.3 including compliance with the Federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and as such the project will have a **less than significant impact** directly or indirectly to a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.				
8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

8a. Response: ***(Source: Appendix B – Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment ~~Analysis~~ conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026)***

Less Than Significant Impact. The project consists of the construction of a fueling station and a convenience store with ancillary parking and landscaping. Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG's modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the RTP, the SCAQMD's AQMP, RTIP, and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 "Typical Growth Scenario." However, due to the size and scope of the proposed project, the Greenhouse Gas Analysis ~~a Climate Change Analysis~~ was commissioned by the applicant to determine if the project related impacts (both construction and operational) would produce GHG ~~GhG~~ emissions that would have a significant direct, indirect or cumulative impact on the environment.

The results of the Greenhouse Gas Analysis ~~Climate Change Analysis~~ indicate that the proposed project will result in a net increase in 1,491 ~~2,025~~ metric tons per year of CO_2e ~~CO2eq~~ . The City of Riverside has not adopted a threshold of significance for GHG ~~GhG~~ emissions. Regional air districts have developed thresholds that may be relevant to the project. Greenhouse gas emissions are estimated for on-site construction activity using CalEEMod. Construction emissions are averaged over 30 years and added to the long-term operational emissions, pursuant to SCAQMD recommendations and using the Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide – Equivalent ($MTCO_2e$) standard for GHG potential impacts.

The project will also comply with the City's General Plan policies and State Building Code provisions designed to reduce GHG emissions. Furthermore, the Greenhouse Gas Analysis demonstrates that the project would be consistent with the SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Consistency (2024-2050 RTP/SCS) and California Air Resource Board's (CARB) 2022 Scoping Plan. Under SB 375, SCAG's 2024-2050 RTP/SCS establishes GHG emissions goals to reduce GHG emissions in the region by eight percent from 2005 levels by 2000 and 19 percent below 2005 levels by 2035. The Scoping Plan sets a path to achieve targets for carbon neutrality and reduce anthropogenic GHG emissions by 85 percent below 1990 levels by 2045 in accordance with AB 1279. ~~GhGs. Finally, the Climate Change Analysis demonstrates that the project will not interfere with the state's goals of reducing GhG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in AB 32 and an 80 percent reduction in GhG emissions below 1990 levels by 2050 as stated in Executive Order S-3-05.~~

Construction Emissions

The project would result in short-term emissions of greenhouse gases during construction. The approximate quantity of daily GHG emissions generated by construction equipment utilized to build the Project is depicted in **Table 7: Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Metric Tons**. ~~The following table lists the estimated greenhouse gas emissions associated with construction of the project.~~

Table 7: Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Metric Tons

Category	$MTCO_2e$
2026 Construction	80
2027 Construction	176
Total Construction Emissions	*256*
30-Year Amortized Construction	9

Source: CalEEMod version 2022.1. Refer to Appendix A – Air Quality Analysis conducted by Kimley-Horn, updated August 2026.

Table 7: Overall Construction Emissions Summary

Year	Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Summer						
2024	5.2	57.2	34.4	0.1	23.0	12.5
2025	18.6	29.6	38.1	0.1	1.9	1.5
Maximum Daily Summer Emissions	**18.58**	**57.16**	**38.06**	**0.08**	**22.98**	**12.54**
Winter						
2024	5.2	57.2	34.3	0.1	22.98	12.54
2025	18.6	29.6	37.9	0.1	1.91	1.49
Maximum Daily Winter Emissions	**18.59**	**57.16**	**37.95**	**0.08**	**22.98**	**12.54**
Maximum Daily Emissions	**18.59**	**57.16**	**38.06**	**0.08**	**22.98**	**12.54**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

As shown, the Project would result in the generation of approximately 256 $MTCO_2e$ over the course of construction. Construction GHG emissions are typically summed and amortized over the lifetime of the Project (assumed to be 30 years), then added to the operational emissions. The amortized Project construction emissions would be 9 $MTCO_2e$ per year. Once construction is complete, the generation of these GHG emissions would cease.

Operation Emissions

The Project would result in direct annual emissions of greenhouse gases at buildout. **Table 8: Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Metric Tons** The following table lists the estimated greenhouse gas emissions associated with construction of the project.

Direct emissions of CO_2 emitted from operation of the project are primarily due to natural gas consumption and mobile source emissions (e.g. motor vehicles).

The Project would also result in indirect greenhouse emissions due to the electricity demands, wastewater treatment needs and solid waste handling, and emissions from fugitive refrigerants. The following table lists estimated greenhouse gas emissions associated with operation of the project.

Table 8

Operational Emissions Source	GhG Emissions ($MTCO_2e$)/year)*
Operational (Mobile) Sources	1,926
Area Sources	0
Electrical Consumption	82
Solid Waste Generation	3
Water and Wastewater Supply	3
Construction (30 year average)	11
Total	2,025
*MT=Metric Tons	

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

Table 8: Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Metric Tons

Operational Emissions Source	~~GhG Emissions~~ $MTCO_2e$ per Year
Construction Amortized Over 30 Years	9
Area Source	0
Energy	43
Mobile	1,278
Waste	2
Water and Wastewater	0
Refrigerants	160
Total	**1,491**
Project-Level Bright Line Threshold	3,000
Exceeds Threshold	No

Source: CalEEMod version 2022.1. Refer to Appendix A – Air Quality Analysis conducted by Kimley-Horn, updated August 2026.

Determining Significance

SCAQMD has drafted a threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ ~~$MTCO_22$~~ for non-residential projects, that can be used as an indicator of a project's significance under CEQA. As shown in the above tables, the Project would generate approximately 1,491 $MTCO_2e$ annually from both construction and operations of the Project. Project-related GHG emissions would not exceed the 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year threshold ~~result in greenhouse gas emissions of 975 $MTCO_2e$ less than the SCAQMD threshold for residential projects.~~

Based on the above analysis, the project's greenhouse gas emissions would be **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

8b. Response: ***(Source: Appendix B – Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment ~~Analysis~~ conducted by Kimley-Horn, dated January 2021 and updated ~~on February 4, 2025~~ August 2026)***

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 ~~GhG~~) threshold. As indicated in Question A above, the project would comply with the City's General Plan policies and State Building Code provisions designed to reduce GHG ~~GhG~~ emissions. In addition, the project would comply with all SCAQMD applicable rules and regulations during construction of the Project and, as demonstrated in the Greenhouse Gas ~~Climate Change~~ Analysis, would be consistent with the SCAG's 2024-2050 RTP/SCS and the CARB's 2022 Scoping Plan ~~will not interfere with the State's goals of reducing GhG emission to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in AB 32 and an 80 percent reduction in GhG emissions below 1990 levels by 2050 as stated in Executive Order S-3-05~~. Based upon the prepared Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment for this project and the discussion above, 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.

9. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐

9a. 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)***

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed fueling station and convenience store uses of the site would typically include the storage and use of hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, pesticides, electronic waste, and other materials. These materials would be stored on site in small quantities, and therefore would not pose a significant threat to the public. Oversight by the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and compliance by the new development with applicable regulations related to the handling, storage and disposal of hazardous materials will cause the project to have a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

9b. 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)***

Less Than Significant. The project may involve the use of hazardous materials but shall comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to the transport, use, disposal, handling, and storage of hazardous waste, including but not limited to Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations implemented by Title 13 of the CCR, which describes strict regulations for the safe transportation of hazardous materials. (See response 7a above for more details).

Compliance with all applicable Federal, State and local laws related to the transportation, use and storage of hazardous materials would reduce the likelihood and severity of accidents during transit, use and storage to a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒

9c. 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)***

No Impact. The proposed project does not involve any emission or handling of any hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing school because the proposed use is located approximately ½ miles from the nearest existing or proposed 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.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9d. 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)*** **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.				
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
9e. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP and March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999), Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005), ALUC Staff Report dated February 8, 2024)*** **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is located within Safety and/or Airport Compatibility Zone(s) D as depicted on Figure 5.7-2 of the General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR for Riverside Municipal Airport as noted in the Riverside County Airport Land use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP). The project was reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on February 8, 2024 to ensure that the project is consistent with the compatibility zone as well as in compliance with the land use standards in the RCALUCP. Because the project has been found to be consistent with the RCALUCP by the ALUC or staff, impacts related to hazards from airports are **less than significant impacts** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.				
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
9f. 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)*** **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will be served by existing, fully improved streets, Arlington Avenue and Monroe Street,. All streets have been designed to meet the Public Works and Fire Departments' specifications. As part of the project's construction, a temporary street closing will be necessary. Any street closing will be of short duration so as not to interfere or impede with any emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, the project will have a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an emergency response or evacuation plan.				
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☐	☒
9g. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Hazard Areas, GIS Map Layer VHFSZ 2010, City of Riverside's EOP, 2002, 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 no 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.				
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐

10a. Response: ***(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Beneficial Uses Receiving Water and Appendix H – Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Woodard Group, dated February 15, 2024)***

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is proposed to have close to 100 percent of impervious surface, with the exception of landscaped areas and a bio-retention basin. Upon construction of the buildings and parking lot for this project, the permeable area of the project site will increase slightly with additional landscaped area. A preliminary WQMP has been submitted and approved by the Public Works Department for this project. The project incorporates site design, source controls and treatment control BMPs, in particular a bio-retention basin. Furthermore, under the NPDES permit managed by the RWQCB. Urban runoff is currently and will continue to be conveyed by local drainage facilities developed throughout the City to regional drainage facilities, and then ultimately to the receiving waters. To address potential water contaminants, the project is required to comply with applicable Federal, State, and local water quality regulations

During the construction phase, a final approved WQMP will be required for the project, as well as coverage under the State's General Permit for Construction Activities, administered by the Santa Ana RWQCB. Storm water management measures will be required to be implemented to effectively control erosion and sedimentation and other construction-related pollutants during construction. Given compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal laws regulating surface water quality and the fact that the project will not result in a net increase of surface water runoff, the proposed project as designed is anticipated to result in a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to any water quality standards or waste discharge.

b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☐	☒

10b. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, RPU Urban Water Management Plan)***

No Impact. The proposed project is located within the Arlington Water Supply Basin. The project consists of the construction of a fueling station and a convenience store with ancillary parking and landscaping. The project is 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 be **no impact** to groundwater supplies and recharge either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

c. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

10i Response: ***(Source: Preliminary Grading Plan and Appendix H – Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Woodard Group, dated February 15, 2024)***

Less Than Significant Impact. The project is subject to NPDES requirements; areas of one acre or more of disturbance are subject to preparing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
prevention of runoff during construction. Erosion, siltation and other possible pollutants associated with long-term implementation of projects are addressed as part of the Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) and grading permit process. Further, the drainage on the site will eventually be captured by a bio-retention basin on the west portion of the project site, which then releases into Monroe Street. Therefore, the project will have a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to existing drainage patterns.				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or-off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
10ii Response: ***(Source: Preliminary Grading Plan and Appendix H – Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Woodard Group, dated February 15, 2024)*** **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located within Flood Zone X (areas of minimal flooding). Underground storm drains and streets are designed to accommodate the 10-year storm flow from curb to curb, while 100-year storms are accommodated within street right-of-ways. The runoff from the project in a developed condition has been studied and is required to be attenuated on-site, so although the drainage pattern will be altered the off-site discharge is the same as the undeveloped condition. Therefore, there will be **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively in the rate or amount of surface runoff that it will not result in flooding on- or off-site.				
iii. 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; or	☐	☐	☒	☐
10iii Response: (Source: ***Preliminary Grading Plan and Appendix H – Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Woodard Group, dated February 15, 2024)*** **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project is over one acre in size and is required to have coverage under the State's General Permit for Construction Activities (SWPPP). As stated in the Permit, during and after construction, best management practices (BMPs) will be implemented to reduce/eliminate adverse water quality impacts resulting from development. Furthermore, the City has ensured that the proposed development does not cause adverse water quality impacts, pursuant to its Municipal Separate Storm System (MS4) permit through the project's WQMP. The proposed development will increase the amount of impervious surface area in the City. This impervious area includes paved parking areas, sidewalks, roadways, and building rooftops; all sources of runoff that may carry pollutants and therefore has the potential to degrade water quality. This development has been required to prepare and implement a WQMP. Preliminary BMP's, in compliance with the WQMP, have been approved by Public Works. This project is considered an infill commercial development, with fully developed properties in each direction. Monroe Street to the west is in its ultimate condition, including curbs and gutters that will convey runoff water further to the southeast. Arlington Avenue will be improved to its ultimate condition, which will include new curbs and gutters, which will convey wastewater to the west. The site strives to keep the drainage proceeding to the west of the site, which is where the existing lot natural drainage flows and in the Monroe Street. Stormwater from the project will be collected and treated with a Bio-retention system. All flows exceeding the design capture volume will be released from the site through a parkway drain and into Monroe Street existing curb and gutter and eventually into the municipally maintained stormwater system. Given the relatively small nature of the project site, the impacts are viewed as **less than significant**.				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
No Impact. The Project site is located within FEMA Flood Zone X, which is described as an "Area of Minimal Flood Hazards". Therefore, there is no impact to the project from flood hazards, or conversely, there is no impact to flood flows from this project.				
d. In floor hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
10d. 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 have generally flat topography and 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;				
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
10e. Response: ***(Source: Appendix H – Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Woodard Group, dated February 15, 2024)*** **Less than Significant Impact.** The WQMP for this project concluded that, given the proper best management practices, including bioretention facilities, will preserve and enhance water quality in the Project site and its immediate surroundings. Impacts are considered **less than significant**.				
11. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
11a. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, City of Riverside GIS/CADME Map Layers)*** **No Impact.** The project is an infill project currently served by fully improved public streets and other infrastructure and does not involve the subdivision of land or the creation of streets that could alter the existing surrounding pattern of development or an established community. Further, the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, the Zoning Code, the Subdivision Code and the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines. Therefore, **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to an established community will occur.				
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐
11b. 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, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)*** **Less than Significant Impact.** The project is an infill project. It is not located within other plan areas and it is not a project of Statewide, Regional or Areawide Significance. However, the project is requesting a modification of the General Plan land use designation of two of the parcels (*i.e.* APNs: 191-150-033 and 191-150-032) from O – Office to MU-V – Mixed-Use Village, which is not considered to be a significant modification. For these reasons, this project will have a **less than significant impact** on an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation directly, indirectly or cumulatively. The				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Housing Crisis Act ("SB 330") prohibits a jurisdiction, like the City, from downsizing property unless the jurisdiction concurrently up-zones another property to increase enough permitted density and ensure there is no net loss in residential capacity city-wide. (Gov. Code, § 66300(b)(1)(A).) Here, two of the parcels are zoned Single Family Residential (R-1-7000) with a maximum residential density of 6.2 dwelling units per acre, or 3.8 dwelling units across the two parcels. (RMC, Table 19.100.040.A.) Applicant proposes to rezone those parcels CR – Commercial Retail, where residential uses are not permitted. Applicant has agreed to include 6 additional units in another housing project within the City, the Alta Cresta Apartments, located at 16084 Alta Cresta Avenue to concurrently increase density and ensure that no net loss occurs. The Project will therefore comply with SB 330. California requires that all jurisdictions adequately plan to meet the housing needs of their community by adopting Housing Elements as part of their General Plan and include an inventory of housing sites, or "adequate sites", with sufficient capacity by income level to accommodate a jurisdiction's Regional Housing Needs Allocation ("**RHNA**") by income category. (Gov. Code § 65583 (a)(3).) One of the parcels, APN 191-150-031, appears on the City's Housing Element Inventory. The City has determined that the remaining sites identified in its Housing Element sites inventory can accommodate the jurisdiction's remaining unmet RHNA by each income category, or if it identifies additional sites so that there is no net loss of residential unit capacity. (Gov. Code § 65863(b)(2).) As noted above, Applicant will construct a 26-unit residential project at the Alta Cresta Apartments, including three affordable units and six density bonus units, so that there is no net loss of residential unit capacity.				
12. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
12a. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)*** **No Impact.** The project does not involve extraction of mineral resources. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
12b. 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 or surrounding area that 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**.				
13. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan	☐	☐	☒	☐

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				

13a. 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-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code, and Appendix E – Noise and Vibration Impact Study conducted by ESA, dated December 2020 and updated on February 2, 2026)***

Less Than Significant. Appendix E – Noise and Vibration Impact Study was prepared for the project by ESA in December 2020 and recently updated on February 2, 2026. The Noise Vibration and Impact Study concluded that the project has the potential to expose persons to or generate of noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan 2025. Acceptable noise levels for residential areas are 60 CNEL and less, with CNEL up to 65 considered to be conditionally acceptable. The EIR for the General Plan concluded that ambient noise impacts are significant and unavoidable and has provided an overriding finding for noise impacts on residents.

The project site is located outside any highway noise contours and railway noise contours.

Construction Noise

Construction on the project site would expose the nearest noise-sensitive uses in the project vicinity to noise levels reaching up to 93 dBA L_{max} or 87 dBA Leq over a period of one hour for the existing residences to the east and south in the project vicinity. During other construction phases, noise associated with on-site activity would be lower than those during the grading period.

Construction noise is temporary and will cease to occur after completion of the project construction. It is considered best practice that all construction, maintenance, or demolition activities within the City's boundary be limited to the hours between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday. No construction work should occur on Sundays and federal holidays.

PDF 2-1: Control of Construction Hours. Construction activities occurring as part of the project shall be subject to the limitations which states that construction activities may occur between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Mondays through Fridays, and between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction activities shall be permitted outside of these hours or on Sundays and federal holidays unless a temporary waiver is granted by the Chief Building Official or his or her authorized representative.

PDF 2-2: Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City/project applicant shall incorporate the following measures as a note on the grading plan cover sheet to ensure that the greatest distance between noise sources and sensitive receptors during construction activities have been achieved.

- Construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained noise mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards.
- Construction staging areas shall be located away from off-site sensitive uses during project construction.
- The project contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site, whenever feasible.

Project Operations

Traffic Noise Impacts from Off-Site Land Uses

To characterize the project area's future day/night noise environment, the noise levels attributed to future traffic volumes on local roadways were estimated using a spreadsheet model developed based on the methodologies provided in FHWA Traffic Noise Model (TNM) Technical Manual. In addition, the Caltrans Technical Noise Supplement (TeNS) document states that the peak hour traffic noise level would be equivalent to the L_{dn} level based on the assumptions of (1) the peak hour traffic volume would be 10 percent of the average daily traffic volume, and

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

(2) the split of daytime and nighttime average daily traffic volume is 85/15 percent.[16] Further, the CNEL level would be 0.3 dBA higher than L_{dn} level based on the assumption of 80 percent in daytime and 5 percent in evening time.

According to City of Riverside 24 Hours Volume Counts (accessed on December 1, 2020), the average daily traffic count (ADT) on Arlington Avenue at Monroe-Adams Street was 26,998 vehicles, and the ADT on Monroe Street at Colorado Street Was 5,924 vehicles. The proposed project would generate a total of 5,555 daily trips, based on the adjusted average daily trips generated by the CalEEMod model in the air quality modeling with the proposed land uses on the project site. The project generated daily trips would contribute to 17 percent of the total ADT (32,553) on E. Arlington Avenue, and increase the traffic noise level 0.8 dBA. This level of noise increases is not perceptible to the human in an outdoor environment. Along Monroe Street, project-related traffic, if we assume the worst case scenario that the entire project daily trips would use Monroe Street as ingress and egress, would contribute to almost 3 dBA increase, due to the traffic volumes almost double when project-related traffic trips (5,555) are added to the existing traffic trips (5,924). However, under this worst case scenario, total daily traffic trips on Monroe Street (11,479) would still not result in the 65 dBA CNEL/Ldn noise contour to impact residences along the west side of Monroe Street, no significant traffic noise impacts would occur. Other roadway segments that have noise level changes less than the 3 dBA increase normally considered to have potentially significant noise impact would not have any project-related traffic noise impacts. Therefore, no significant traffic noise impact would occur from the implementation of the project.

Noise Impacts from On-Site Land Uses

The proposed project convenience store would have bring customers to the project site with slow-moving vehicles looking for a parking space and from the project site. This pattern of vehicle movement is similar to those vehicles getting fuels at the fueling stations. There will be noise-generating activities, such as loading/unloading, slow-moving vehicles, engine- starting before vehicles driving off, customer conversation in the parking area or at the fueling stations.

Residences to the east are the closest off-site noise-sensitive uses that would be located at 50 feet from the onsite parking activity and slow-moving vehicles. They are also close to the trash enclosure where the trash pickup would occur. However, these residences would be more than 120 feet from the potential store-front loading/unloading area. Residences to the south are approximately 100 feet away from these activities and would receive at least a 6 dBA noise reduction when compared to the noise level experienced at 50 feet. These residences are also more than 150 feet away from the potential store-front loading/unloading area.

Loading/unloading activity generates approximately 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. Slow-moving vehicles generate approximately 60 to 65 dBA when passing at a distance of 15 feet. Engine start-up generate approximately 70 to 75 dBA at 15 feet. Customer conversation results in approximately 65 to 70 dBA at a distance of 5 feet. At a distance of 50 feet, the noise level at 15 feet would be attenuated by 10 dBA, and the noise level at 5 feet would be attenuated by 20 dBA. At a distance of 120 feet, the noise level would be reduced by 8 dBA when compared to the noise level at 50 feet. Therefore, slow-moving vehicles would result in noise levels up to 55 dBA at the nearest residences to the east and south. Engine start-up would result in noise levels up to 65 dBA at the nearest residences to the east and south. Customer conversation would result in noise levels up to 60 dBA at the nearest residences to the east and south. Loading/unloading activity noise would be reduced to 67 dBA at 120 feet and 65 dBA at 150 feet. However, loading/unloading activity would occur only during the daytime hours.

The City's Municipal Code states that, for noise-generating events that last a cumulative period of more than one minute (but less than 5 minutes) in any hour, the exterior noise standard of the residential uses would be 55 dBA plus 15 dBA during daytime hours (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.), or 70 dBA, and 45 dBA plus 15 dBA during the nighttime hours (10 p.m. to 7 a.m. next morning), or 60 dBA. Noise associated with engine start-up before vehicles driving off would potentially exceed the noise threshold for nighttime hours. It is therefore recommended that a stand-alone noise barrier with a minimum height of 6 feet be constructed along the project's eastern property line.

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

Mitigation

Construction

No mitigation measures would be necessary for the proposed project during construction, with the implementation of the PDF-2.1 and PDF-2.2 above.

Operations

To mitigate noise impacts on existing residential uses adjacent to the project site, Appendix E – Noise and Vibration Impact Study recommended implementation of a six-foot high stand-alone noise barrier along the project's eastern property line adjacent to the residential uses to the east. As required by the Riverside Municipal Code and recommended in Appendix E, the project incorporates a six-foot wall to separate the project from the adjacent residential uses. Therefore, with the implementation of this project design feature, the proposed project's operations will have a **less than significant** impact.

b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

13b. 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-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, FPEIR Table 5.11-G – Vibration Source Levels For Construction Equipment, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, and Appendix E – Noise and Vibration Impact Study conducted by ESA, dated December 2020 and updated on February 2, 2026)***

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction related activities although short term, are the most common source of ground borne noise and vibration that could affect occupants of neighboring uses. The acoustical analysis has assessed the potential for noise and ground-borne vibration impacts related to noise land use compatibility, construction-related noise per GP 2025 FPEIR, Table 5.11-G, Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment, on-site stationary noise sources, and vehicular-related noise. The acoustical analysis found the project to be in compliance with the City's noise standards and found impacts related to groundborne vibration and groundborne noise levels as a result of the project to be **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively based on the following findings:

Residential buildings adjacent to the project site are approximately 50 feet from the nearest construction area on the project site. Based on the noise study, it would take a vibration PPV level of more than 0.5 inch/sec (or 102 VdB) to potentially result in any building damages.

The noise study concluded that none of the construction activities anticipated on the project site would result in a vibration level that would reach 0.5 inch/sec PPV (or 102 VdB) at 25 feet from each of the project construction equipment and/or activities. At 50 feet, these vibration levels would be attenuated by 9 VdB to 93 VdB. Other off-site buildings are farther away from the project site and would be exposed to even lower construction vibration levels. Therefore, no building damages would occur as a result of the project construction.

The noise study also concludes that the maximum vibration levels that would result from the on-site construction equipment. The projected maximum construction vibration level during project construction at the nearest noise-sensitive receiver locations would not exceed the FTA's vibration standards of 78 VdB for sensitive uses (residences) or the FTA's 84 VdB threshold for commercial/industrial office buildings. No significant construction vibration impacts would occur.

It is conceivable that, during construction of the project, temporary increases in noise levels will occur on a periodic basis. However, City regulations prohibit outdoor construction outside of the hours of 7am and 7pm on weekdays, 8am to 5pm on Saturdays, or any time during Sundays or Federal holidays. Compliance with these restrictions is not considered to be mitigation, and impacts are considered to be **less than significant**.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

13c. 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), and Noise and Vibration Impact Study conducted by ESA on December 2020***

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is located within an airport land use plan and within the 55 CNEL airport noise contour area of the Riverside Municipal Airport as depicted on Figure N-8 of the Noise Element of the General Plan 2025. General Plan 2025 Policies N-1.5, CCM-11.7, N-2.1, N-2.2, N-2.5, N-3.2 through 3.4, LU-22.3 through 22.5 and Municipal Code regulations, Sections 19.58 and 12.14 restrict noise sensitive development within areas subject to high noise levels (over 65 dB CNEL) and limit the intensity and height of development within aircraft hazard zones. These controls are consistent with the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP). Further, the project is consistent with both the General Plan 2025 and the RCALUCP.

The maximum threshold for the proposed use, 'Office Buildings, Business, Commercial, Professional', considers a maximum of 65 dBA as "normally acceptable" as shown in Figure N-10 dBA. Because the noise contour level for the project site is found to be a normally acceptable level for the proposed use per Figure N-10 of the Noise Element of the General Plan 2025, impacts related to exposure of people residing or working in an airport land use plan area to excessive noise is considered **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial unplanned 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

14a. 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)***

Less Than Significant Impact. The project involves new businesses that may directly induce population growth, and may involve additional infrastructure that could indirectly induce population growth. However, the project is consistent with the proposed C Commercial) land use designation established under the General Plan 2025 Program and the additional infrastructure is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Program. The General Plan 2025 Final PEIR determined that Citywide, future development anticipated under the General Plan 2025 Typical scenario would not have significant population growth impacts. Because the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical growth scenario and population growth impacts were previously evaluated in the GP 2025 FPEIR the project does not result in new impacts beyond those previously evaluated in the GP 2025 FPEIR; therefore, the impacts will be **less than significant** both directly and indirectly.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14b. Response: ***(Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)*** **No Impact.** The project will not displace existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the project site is proposed on vacant land that has no existing housing that will be removed or affected by the proposed project. Therefore, there will be **no impact** on existing housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
15. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
15a. Response: ***(Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1)*** **No Impact.** The project consists of the construction of a fueling station and a convenience store with ancillary parking and landscaping. Adequate fire facilities and services are provided by Station #5 located at 5883 Arlington Avenue to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Fire Department practices, there will be **no impact** on the demand for additional fire facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
b. Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
15b. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers)*** **Less Than Significant.** The project consists of a fueling station and a convenience store. Adequate police facilities and services are provided by the Neighborhood Policing Center located at 7020 University Avenue to serve this project. In addition, the following CPTED principles have been applied to the project to ensure greater security and crime prevention through design; 1) natural surveillance (by keeping the parking and fueling areas well lit, eliminating hiding spots, and using closed circuit television), 2) natural access control (by using curbing and landscaping to direct auto and foot traffic to a controlled and visible area), 3) territorial reinforcement (by using security signage), and 4) maintenance. With implementation of these CPTED principles, General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Police Department practices, there will be **less than significant impacts** on the demand for additional police facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
c. Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
15c. Response: ***(Source: FPEIR Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D – RUSD, Figure 5.13-3 – AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E – AUSD, Table 5.13-G – Student Generation for RUSD and AUSD By Education Level, and Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries)*** **No Impact.** The project is non-residential use that will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase numbers of school age children. Therefore, there will be **no impact** on the demand for additional school 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
d. Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
15d. 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.** The project is a non-residential use that will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase the population. Therefore, there will be **no impact** on the demand for additional park facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
e. Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
15e. 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.** The project consists of a fueling station and a convenience store with ancillary parking and landscaping. Adequate public facilities and services, including libraries and community centers, are provided in the Ramona Neighborhood to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Park and Recreation and Community Services and Library practices, there will be **no impact** on the demand for additional public facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
16. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
16a. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Figure CCM-6 – Master plan of Trails and Bikeways, Parks Master Plan 2003, 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, Table 5.14-D – Inventory of Existing Community Centers, Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 16.60 - Local Park Development Fees, Bicycle Master Plan May 2007)*** **No Impact.** The General Plan 2025 analyzed the proposed non-residential General Plan Land Use for this property. The project is consistent with the adopted General Plan 2025 and will pay applicable Park Development Impact Fees to the City of Riverside Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department; therefore this project will have a **no impact** 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
16b. Response: ***(Source: project information)*** **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.				
17. TRANSPORTATION Would the project result in:				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☒	☐	☐

17a. Response: ***(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, SCAG RTP, and Appendix F – Traffic Impact Analysis conducted by Trames Solutions, Inc., dated July 29, 2025)***

Less than Significant. Roadway capacity is adequate to accommodate the projected traffic volumes, of the proposed project. As determined by the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the proposed project, the proposed project will operate at LOS C for opening year (2022) conditions, which is better than the required LOS D. Therefore, the increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system is **less than significant** directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

17b. Response: ***(Source: Appendix F – Traffic Impact Analysis conducted by Trames Solutions, Inc., dated July 29, 2025)***

Less than Significant. Due to the passage of Senate Bill 743 (SB 743), CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.3) require the use of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the metric for transportation analysis rather than level of service (LOS). This approach will take effect on July 1, 2020. The City of Riverside has developed draft guidelines for screening projects.

A local serving retail project less than 50,000 square feet may be presumed to have a less than significant impact absent substantial evidence to the contrary. Local serving retail generally improves the convenience of shopping close to home and has the effect of reducing vehicle travel. Since the project will consist of approximately 4,650 sf of building area and is intended to serve the adjacent community, a **less than significant impact** can be determined from a vehicle miles perspective.

c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒

17c. Response: (*Source:* RCALUCP, *ALUC Staff Report dated February 8, 2024)*

No Impact. Although this project lies with the Riverside Municipal Airport influence area, the project has been designed so as not to impact air traffic patterns. Additionally, the project was reviewed by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission on February 8, 2024, and it was determined that the requested entitlements are either consistent or conditionally consistent with the RCALUCP.

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

17d. Response: ***(Source: Project Site Plans, Lane Striping and Signing Plans, and Appendix F – Project Specific Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Trames Solutions, Inc., dated July 29, 2025)***

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is compatible with adjacent existing uses. As well, it has been designed so as not to cause any incompatible use or additional or any hazards to the surrounding area or general public. As a condition of approval, the project will be required to install a stop sign at the exit of this project onto

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Arlington Avenue. With this revision, this project will have a **less than significant impact** on increasing hazards through design or incompatible uses either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
17e. Response: ***(Source: California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, Municipal Code, and Fire Code, and Appendix F – Project Specific Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Trames Solutions, Inc., dated July 29, 2025)*** **Less Than Significant.** The project has the potential during construction to obstruct lanes of travel that may have an impact on emergency access. However, the project has been conditioned to require at least one lane of travel to be open and available at all times. This will eliminate any impact to emergency access.				
18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☐	☒
18a. Response: (*Source: AB52 Consultation, Appendix D – Cultural Resources Report conducted by Brian F. Smith and Associates, dated December 14, 2020 and revised on March 20, 2024 and September 5, 2024)* **No Impact**. As detailed in Section 5 – Cultural Resources, no historic resources listed or eligible for listing in a State or local register of historic resources are located on-site. Therefore, no impacts related to historic tribal cultural resources defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k) would occur.				
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☒	☐	☐
18b. Response: ***(Source: AB52 Consultation, General Plan EIR Figure 5.51, Appendix D – Cultural Resource Report conducted by Brian F. Smith and Associates, dated December 14, 2020 and revised on March 20, 2024 and September 5, 2024)*** **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** The Native American Historic Resource Protection Act (AB 52) took effect on July 1, 2015, and incorporates tribal consultation and analysis of impacts to tribal cultural resources (TCR) into the CEQA process. AB 52 requires TCRs to be analyzed like any other CEQA topic and establishes a consultation process for lead agencies and California tribes. Projects that require a Notice of Preparation of an EIR or Notice of Intent to adopt an ND or MND are subject to AB 52. A significant impact on a TCR is considered a significant environmental impact, requiring feasible mitigation measures. On February 9, 2024, in accordance with AB 52 requirements, letters of inquiry were sent out to tribal contacts who may have an interest in the Project Site. Four tribal contacts responded: the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, the				

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

Morongo Band of Mission Indians, the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, and the Pechanga Band of Indians. Three tribal contacts requested government-to-government consultation, which occurred in March and April of 2024. The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians met with City staff on April 1, 2024. The Morongo Band of Mission Indians met with City staff on April 1, 2024. The Pechanga Band of Indians met with City staff on March 14, 2024. The Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians did not meet with City staff but did recommend archaeological monitoring for all ground disturbing activities, a monitoring report, and protocols for discovery of cultural material and human remains.

SB 18 (Government Code Sections 65352.3 and 65352.4) requires that prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005, a City or County must consult with Native American tribes with respect to the possible preservation of, or the mitigation of impacts to, specified Native American places, features, and objects located within that jurisdiction.

On February 9, 2024, per SB 18 requirements, letters of inquiry were sent out to tribal contacts who may have an interest in the Project Site. Three tribal contacts requested government-to-government consultations, which occurred in March and April of 2024. The Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians met with City staff on March 5, 2024. The Pechanga Band of Indians met with City staff on March 14, 2024. The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians met with City staff on April 1, 2024. As noted above, the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians did not meet with City staff but did recommend archaeological monitoring for all ground disturbing activities, a monitoring report, and protocols for discovery of cultural material and human remains.

After meeting with each tribal organization described above, the City sent final memorandums to each organization on May 8, 2024, to confirm concurrence with implementing Mitigation Measures MM CUL-1 through MM CUL-4 as well as a Standard Condition of Approval regarding steps to address the discovery of human remains to minimize impacts to tribal cultural resources. Each tribe that responded has concurred with the listed MM CUL-1 through MM CUL-4, and the Standard Condition of Approval would reduce impacts related to tribal cultural resources to less than significant levels.

MM CUL-1: Prior to grading permit issuance, if there are any changes to project site design and/or proposed grades, the Applicant and the City shall contact interested tribes to provide an electronic copy of the revised plans for review. Additional consultation shall occur between the City, developer/applicant, and consulting tribes to discuss any proposed changes and review any new impacts and/or potential avoidance/preservation of the cultural resources on the project site. The City and the developer/applicant shall make all attempts to avoid and/or preserve in place as many cultural and paleontological resources as possible that are located on the project site if the site design and/or proposed grades should be revised. In the event of inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources, work shall temporarily halt until agreements are executed with consulting tribe, to provide tribal monitoring for ground disturbing activities.

MM CUL-2: Archaeological and Paleontological Monitoring: At least 30 days prior to application for a grading permit and before any grading, excavation and/or ground disturbing activities take place, the developer/applicant shall retain a Secretary of Interior Standards qualified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown archaeological resources.

1. The project archaeologist, in consultation with consulting tribes, the Developer, and the City, shall develop an Archaeological Monitoring Plan to address the details, timing, and responsibility of all archaeological and cultural activities that will occur on the project site. Details in the plan shall include:

a. Project grading and development scheduling;

b. The development of a rotating or simultaneous schedule in coordination with the developer/applicant and the project archaeologist for designated Native American Tribal Monitors from the consulting tribes during grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities on the site, including the scheduling, safety requirements, duties, scope of work, and Native American Tribal Monitors' authority to stop and redirect grading activities in coordination with all project archaeologists;

c. The protocols and stipulations that the Applicant, tribes, and project archaeologist/paleontologist will follow in the event of inadvertent cultural resources discoveries, including any newly discovered cultural resource deposits, or nonrenewable paleontological resources that shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation;

d. Treatment and final disposition of any cultural and paleontological resources, sacred sites, and human remains if discovered on the project site;

and

e. The scheduling and timing of the Cultural Sensitivity Training noted in mitigation measure MM-CUL-4.

MM-CUL-3: Treatment and Disposition of Cultural Resources: In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this project, the following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:

1. Consulting Tribes Notified: within 24 hours of discovery, the consulting tribe(s) shall be notified via email and phone. Consulting tribe(s) will be allowed access to the discovery, in order to assist with the significance evaluation.

2. Temporary Curation and Storage: During the course of construction, all discovered resources shall be temporarily curated in a secure location on site or at the offices of the project archaeologist. The removal of any artifacts from the project site will need to be thoroughly inventoried with tribal monitor oversight of the process; and

3. Treatment and Final Disposition: The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources. The Applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the City of Riverside Community and Economic Development Department with evidence of same:

a. Accommodate the process for on-site reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed;

b. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore will be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation;

c. If more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the project and cannot come to a consensus as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center or Riverside Metropolitan Museum by default; and

d. At the completion of grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities on the site, a Phase IV Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the City documenting monitoring activities conducted by the project archaeologist and Native Tribal Monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts to the known resources on the property; describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled; document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources; provide evidence of the required cultural sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grade meeting; and, in a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist. All reports produced will be submitted to the City of Riverside, Eastern Information Center, and interested tribes.

MM-CUL-4: Worker's Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training: The Secretary of Interior Standards County certified archaeologist and Native American monitors shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the developer/permit holder's contractors to provide conduct mandatory Worker Environmental Awareness Program Training Program (WEAP) training to all construction grading personnel. The training will include a brief review of the cultural sensitivity of the project and the surrounding area, summarize and show examples of the types of resources that could be identified during earthmoving activities and provide notification protocols to be followed in the event suspected cultural resources are identified. Safety protocols would also be discussed to ensure the safety

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

of the monitors and construction crew. Only construction personnel who have received this training can conduct construction and disturbance activities in sensitive areas. A sign-in sheet for attendees of this training shall be included in the Phase IV Monitoring Report.

A STANDARD CONDITION OF APPROVAL WILL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING – CONSISTENT WITH STATE LAW: Discovery of Human Remains: In the event that human remains (or remains that may be human) are discovered at the Project site during grading or earthmoving, the construction contractors, Project Archaeologist, and/or designated Native American Monitor shall immediately stop all activities within 100 feet of the find. The Project proponent shall then inform the Riverside County Coroner and the City of Riverside Community & Economic Development Department immediately, and the coroner shall be permitted to examine the remains as required by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b) unless more current State law requirements are in effect at the time of the discovery. No photography of any human remains shall be taken, unless directed by the Riverside County Coroner. Section 7050.5 requires that excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If human remains are determined as those of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within the period specified by law (24 hours). The coroner shall contact the NAHC to determine the most likely descendant(s). The MLD shall complete his or her inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The Disposition of the remains shall be overseen by the most likely descendant(s) to determine the most appropriate means of treating the human remains and any associated grave artifacts.

The specific locations of Native American burials and reburials will be proprietary and not disclosed to the general public. The County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission in accordance with California Public Resources Code 5097.98.

According to California Health and Safety Code, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery (Section 8100), and disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony (Section 7052). The disposition of the remains shall be determined in consultation between the Project proponent and the MLD. In the event that the Project proponent and the MLD are in disagreement regarding the disposition of the remains, State law will apply and the median and decision process will occur with the NAHC (see Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(e) and 5097.94(k)).

Incorporation of the above mitigation measures and the Standard Condition of Approval would reduce impacts to **less than significant** levels.

19. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES. Would the project:				
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒

19a. Response: ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, RPU, FPEIR Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU Including Water Reliability for 2025)***

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.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	☒

19b. 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, Table 5.16-H – Current and Projected Domestic Water Supply (acre-ft/year) 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.

c. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

19c. 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)***

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.

d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☐	☒

19d. 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.

e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

19e. 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.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
20. WILDFIRE If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
20a. Response: ***(Source: General Plan Figures PS7 and PS8.1, Project Information*****)** **No Impact.** The project is not in or near a state responsibility area, nor is it in a very high fire hazard severity zone. Therefore, there will be **no impact** to any emergency response plan.				
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☐	☒
20b. Response: ***(Source: General Plan Figures PS7, Project Information*****)** **No Impact.** The project is not in or near a state responsibility area, nor is it in a very high fire hazard severity zone. Therefore, there will be **no impact** from any wildfire risks.				
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
20c. Response: ***(Source: General Plan Figures PS7, Project Information)*** **No Impact.** The project is not in or near a state responsibility area, nor is it in a very high fire hazard severity zone. Therefore, there will be **no impact** from the installation of infrastructure that may impact wildfire risks.				
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☐	☒
20d. Response: ***(Source: General Plan Figures PS7, Project Information)*** **No Impact.** The project is not in or near a state responsibility area, nor is it in a very high fire hazard severity zone. Additionally, the Project site is generally flat, with no significant change in topography. Therefore, there will be **no impact** from downstream flooding or landslides that may impact wildfire risks.				
21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
21a. 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***				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Appendix D —Cultural Resources Report prepared by Brian F. Smith Associates, dated December 14, 2020 and revised on March 20, 2024 and September 5, 2024) **Less Than Significant Impact 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**. As discussed in Section 5 – Cultural Resources and Section 18 – Tribal Cultural Resources, there are no known archaeological resources located on the project site resulting in a low potential that archaeological resources would be encountered during ground-disturbing activities for the proposed Project. However, Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-4 would be implemented in order to reduce impacts to a **less than significant** level.				
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
21b. 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 proposed land use designation of MU-V – Mixed Use Village in 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**.				
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐
21c. Response: ***(Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program)*** **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** Effects on human beings were evaluated as part of the aesthetics, air quality, hydrology & water quality, noise, population and housing, public facilities, hazards and hazardous materials, recreation, and transportation traffic sections of this initial study. As indicated in the above analysis, with implementation of applicable regulatory requirements and Project mitigation measures in this Initial Study, the Project would not result in any unmitigated significant adverse impacts. Based on the analysis and conclusions in this Initial Study, the project, with mitigation, 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 with mitigation**.				

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/ Tribal Cultural Resources	**MM CUL-1:** Prior to grading permit issuance, if there are any changes to project site design and/or proposed grades, the Applicant and the City shall contact interested tribes to provide an electronic copy of the revised plans for review. Additional consultation shall occur between the City, developer/applicant, and consulting tribes to discuss any proposed changes and review any new impacts and/or potential avoidance/preservation of the cultural resources on the project site. The City and the developer/applicant shall make all attempts to avoid and/or preserve in place as many cultural and paleontological resources as possible that are located on the project site if the site design and/or proposed grades should be revised. In the event of inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources, work shall temporarily halt until agreements are executed with consulting tribe, to provide tribal monitoring for ground disturbing activities.	Prior to the issuance of grading permits	Community and Economic Development Department – Planning Division; Public Works Department	Notification of the City by the Applicant
Cultural Resources/ Tribal Cultural Resources	**MM CUL-2: Archaeological and Paleontological Monitoring:** At least 30 days prior to application for a grading permit and before any grading, excavation and/or ground disturbing activities take place, the developer/applicant shall retain a Secretary of Interior Standards qualified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown archaeological resources. 1. The project archaeologist, in consultation with consulting tribes, the Developer, and the City, shall develop an Archaeological Monitoring Plan to address the details, timing, and responsibility of all	At least 30 days prior to the application for a grading permit, before grading, excavation, and/or ground disturbing activities	Community and Economic Development Department – Planning Division; Public Works Department	Submission of an Archaeological Monitoring Plan

[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
	archaeological and cultural activities that will occur on the project site. Details in the plan shall include: a. Project grading and development scheduling; b. The development of a rotating or simultaneous schedule in coordination with the developer/applicant and the project archaeologist for designated Native American Tribal Monitors from the consulting tribes during grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities on the site, including the scheduling, safety requirements, duties, scope of work, and Native American Tribal Monitors' authority to stop and redirect grading activities in coordination with all project archaeologists; c. The protocols and stipulations that the Applicant, tribes, and project archaeologist/paleontologist will follow in the event of inadvertent cultural resources discoveries, including any newly discovered cultural resource deposits, or nonrenewable paleontological resources that shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation; d. Treatment and final disposition of any cultural and paleontological resources, sacred sites, and human remains if discovered on the project site; and e. The scheduling and timing of the Cultural Sensitivity Training noted in mitigation measure MM-CUL-4.			
Cultural Resources/	**MM-CUL-3: Treatment and Disposition of Cultural Resources:** In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this	During construction	Community and Economic Development Department – Planning Division	Submission of a Phase IV Monitoring Report

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party[1]	Monitoring/Reporting Method
Tribal Cultural Resources	project, the following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries: 1. **Consulting Tribes Notified:** within 24 hours of discovery, the consulting tribe(s) shall be notified via email and phone. Consulting tribe(s) will be allowed access to the discovery, in order to assist with the significance evaluation. 2. **Temporary Curation and Storage:** During the course of construction, all discovered resources shall be temporarily curated in a secure location on site or at the offices of the project archaeologist. The removal of any artifacts from the project site will need to be thoroughly inventoried with tribal monitor oversight of the process; and 3. **Treatment and Final Disposition:** The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources. The Applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the City of Riverside Community and Economic Development Department with evidence of same: a. Accommodate the process for on-site reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed; b. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County			

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party[1]	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore will be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation; c. If more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the project and cannot come to a consensus as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center or Riverside Metropolitan Museum by default; and d. At the completion of grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities on the site, a Phase IV Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the City documenting monitoring activities conducted by the project archaeologist and Native Tribal Monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts to the known resources on the property; describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled; document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources; provide evidence of the required cultural sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grade meeting; and, in a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist. All reports produced will be submitted to the City of Riverside, Eastern Information Center, and interested tribes.			

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party[1]	Monitoring/Reporting Method
Cultural Resources/ Tribal Cultural Resources	**MM-CUL-4: Worker's Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training:** The Secretary of Interior Standards County certified archaeologist and Native American monitors shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the developer/permit holder's contractors to provide conduct mandatory Worker Environmental Awareness Program Training Program (WEAP) training to all construction grading personnel. The training will include a brief review of the cultural sensitivity of the project and the surrounding area, summarize and show examples of the types of resources that could be identified during earthmoving activities and provide notification protocols to be followed in the event suspected cultural resources are identified. Safety protocols would also be discussed to ensure the safety of the monitors and construction crew. Only construction personnel who have received this training can conduct construction and disturbance activities in sensitive areas. A sign-in sheet for attendees of this training shall be included in the Phase IV Monitoring Report.	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit	Community and Economic Development Department – Planning Division; Building and Safety Division; Public Works Department	Submission of a Phase IV Monitoring Report
Project Design Features				
Air Quality	**PDF AQ-1:** Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the City Engineer shall confirm that the Grading Plan, Building Plans and Specifications require all construction contractors to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) Rules 402 and 403 to minimize construction emissions of dust and particulates. The measures include, but are not limited to, the following: Portions of a construction site to remain inactive longer than a period of three months will be seeded and watered until grass cover is grown or otherwise stabilized.	Prior to issuance of grading permits and throughout construction activities	Community and Economic Development Department – Planning Division; Building and Safety Division; Public Works/City Engineer	Review and approval of grading plans, construction notes, and contract specifications demonstrating incorporation of SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403 requirements; periodic site inspections during construction to verify implementation of dust-control measures (watering, stabilization, street sweeping, covering haul trucks, and minimizing disturbed areas). Supported by contractor compliance documentation and inspection reports

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party[1]	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	All on-site roads will be paved as soon as feasible or watered periodically or chemically stabilized. All material transported off site will be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation operations will be minimized at all times. Where vehicles leave a construction site and enter adjacent public streets, the streets will be swept daily or washed down at the end of the workday to remove soil tracked onto the paved surface.			
Air Quality	**PDF AQ-2:** The applicant shall require by contract specifications that the interior and exterior architectural coatings (paint and primer including parking lot paint) products used would have a volatile organic compound rating of 50 grams per liter or less. Contract specifications shall be included in the construction documents for the Project, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Riverside prior to the issuance of building permits.	Prior to issuance of building permits	Community and Economic Development Department – Building and Safety Division; Planning Division	Review of building plans, specifications, and construction documents demonstrating that all interior and exterior architectural coatings, primers, and parking lot paints comply with the specified VOC limit of 50 g/L or less. Verification through submitted product data sheets, manufacturer specifications, or contractor certification prior to permit issuance.
Air Quality	**PDF AQ-3:** Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the City Engineer shall confirm that the Grading Plan, Building Plans and Specifications require all construction contractors to incorporate the following measures to minimize construction emissions. These features shall be included in applicable bid documents and included on the grading plans. • All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower meets California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards or incorporate CARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emission Control	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit	Community and Economic Development Department – Planning Division; Building and Safety Division; Public Works Department	Submission of equipment compliance documentation and inspection records (manufacturer certification confirming Tier 4 Final compliance or equivalent for each piece of equipment greater than 50 horsepower)

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party[1]	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	Strategy (VDECS) (to reduce PM emissions by at least 85 percent or to achieve PM emissions levels of 0.01 grams per brake-horsepower-hour or less, per Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Sections 2700-2710). Requirements for Tier 4 Final equipment and the option for Level 3 VDECS shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. A copy of each unit's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation (certified tier specification or model year specification), and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be provided to the City at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment. • Construction equipment shall be properly maintained according to manufacturer specifications. • All diesel-powered construction equipment, delivery vehicles, and delivery trucks shall be turned off when not in use. On-site idling shall be limited to three minutes in any one hour.			