RESOLUTION NO. 2009-009
A RESOLUTION OF THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE MID-COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, AMENDMENT NO. 2 – GARNET AND WEST GARNET SUB-AREAS

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside (the "Agency") has prepared a Redevelopment Plan for the Mid-County Redevelopment Project Area, Amendment No. 2 – Garnet and West Garnet Sub-Areas (the "Redevelopment Plan") in compliance with the California Community Redevelopment Law (Health and Safety Code, Sections 33000, et seq.; the "CRL"); and,

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Planning Commission (the "Planning Commission") has approved and forwarded to the Agency its report that the proposed Redevelopment Plan is in conformity with the Riverside County General Plan and has recommended approval of said Redevelopment Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared on the Redevelopment Plan and all actions required by applicable law related to the preparation, circulation, and review of the Draft Environmental Impact Report have been taken; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the Final Environmental Impact Report and the Mitigation Monitoring Program, attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference, with respect to the adoption of the Redevelopment Plan; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to public notice duly given, the Board of Supervisors and the Agency held a full and fair joint public hearing on the proposed Redevelopment Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report on December 16, 2008; and,

WHEREAS, all legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: MICHELLE CLACK DATE 12/22/08

C

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside as follows:

1. The Board of Supervisors hereby certifies that the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Redevelopment Plan for the Mid-County Redevelopment Project Area, Amendment No. 2 – Garnet and West Garnet Sub-Areas, as determined herein, has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended, and the Guidelines promulgated thereunder, that the Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the information contained in said Environmental Impact Report, and that said Environmental Impact Report reflects the independent judgment of the Board of Supervisors.

2. The Board of Supervisors hereby specifically finds and determines, based upon the finding set forth herein, that mitigation measures have been required that mitigate or avoid significant adverse environmental effects identified in said Environmental Impact Report for the Redevelopment Plan.

3. The Board of Supervisors hereby further finds with respect to the adverse environmental impacts detailed in the Final Environmental Impact Report:

a) That the adverse environmental impacts associated with the adoption of the Redevelopment Plan have been considered and recognized by the Agency.

b) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen potentially significant environmental effects.

4. The Agency hereby further finds that the project alternative identified in the EIR either would not achieve the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan or would do so only with unacceptable adverse impacts. Accordingly, and for the reasons set forth herein and in the EIR, none of the alternatives are feasible, nor are the alternative environmentally superior. The *No-Project Alternative* is not environmentally superior to the proposed Project because it would result in the indefinite continuation of the adverse effects of blighting conditions, while

adversely affecting the overall financial health of the Agency and County. The *Reduced Amendment Area Boundaries* alternative would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Project because it would result in the indefinite continuation of blighting conditions on land removed from the Project area. The *Extend Amendment Area Boundaries* alternative would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Project because it would result in unforeseen impacts and would intensify other impacts. The *Alternative Financing* alternative would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Project because the scope of public improvement and other projects that could be undertaken will be limited due to restricted financial resources. This in turn will reduce the ability to reverse blighting conditions. The *Alternative Sites* alternative is not considered feasible to the proposed Project because it would not meet the basic objectives of the proposed Project and would allow conditions of blight to remain.

5. The Board of Supervisors finds that facts supporting the above-specified findings are contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report, the Redevelopment Plan, and the information provided to this Agency during the public hearing conducted on December 16, 2008 with respect to the Redevelopment Plan and the Final Environmental Impact Report. Mitigation measures will be made conditions of development projects in the Project area as applicable and are intended to mitigate and/or avoid the significant environmental effects identified in the Final Environmental Impact Report.

6. The Board of Supervisors hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Plan included in the Final Environmental Impact Report as the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Redevelopment Plan.

7. The Clerk of the Board, in cooperation with the Executive Director of the Agency, is hereby authorized and directed to file with the County Clerk of the County of Riverside a

Notice of Determination, pursuant to Title 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15094, along with fees pursuant to Title 14 California Code of Regulations Section 753.5.

Exhibit "A"

Environmental Impact Report for the Mid-County Project Area

Memorandum for file:

December 23, 2008

The following letter was received from the Coachella Valley Water District in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Mid-County Project Area, Amendment No. 2 – Cherry Valley, Garnet, and West Garnet.

The review period ended on December 15, 2008, and the letter was received on December 23, 2008. The late arrival of the response letter meant that it was not included in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). It is included here to acknowledge its receipt in response to the DEIR.

Established in 1918 as a public agency

Coachella Valley Water District

Directors:
Peter Nelson, President
Patricia A. Larson, Vice President
Telis Codekas
John W. McFadden
Russell Kitahara

Officers:
Steven B. Robbins, General Manager-Chief Engineer
Julia Hernandez, Secretary
Mark Beuhler, Asst. General Manager
Dan Parks, Asst. To General Manager
Redwine and Sherrill, Attorneys

December 19, 2008

File: 1150.013
1150.17

Ernest W. Glover
Urban Futures, Inc./GRC Redevelopment Planning
3111 North Tustin, Suite 230
Orange, CA 92865

Dear Mr. Glover:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Mid-County Project Area, Amendment No. 2 – Cherry Valley, Garnet and West Garnet Proposed by the Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside

Thank you for affording the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD) the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Mid-County Project Area, Amendment No. 2 – Cherry Valley, Garnet and West Garnet proposed by the Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside. CVWD provides domestic water, wastewater, recycled water, irrigation/drainage, regional stormwater protection and groundwater management services to a population of 265,000 throughout the Coachella Valley in Southern California.

At this time, we submit the following comments regarding the proposed project:

1. Page 110, Existing Conditions, Water- In the second paragraph on page 110, please revise the last three sentences to read: "*In addition to groundwater supplies, CVWD and Desert Water Agency (DWA) obtain water from the SWP and Metropolitan. CVWD and DWA Table A amount total 194,100 af/yr. CVWD and DWA do not receive this allotment directly, rather it is delivered to Metropolitan, which in turn delivers to CVWD and DWA an equal amount of Colorado River water.*"

2. Page 112, Wastewater- Please revise the last three sentences of the second paragraph to read: "*Three of the reclamation plants generate recycled water, two at a tertiary (three-stage) level. CVWD recently completed capacity expansion at one reclamation plant and process improvements at another. Demand is compounded by the conversion in some areas from septic tanks to sewer systems, which are better for groundwater quality.*"

And please revise the first sentence of the third paragraph to read: "*The collection system consists of 1,078 miles of piping to collect raw sewage and transport it to the closest treatment facility.*"

If you have any questions, please contact Luke Stowe, Senior Environmental Specialist, at extension 2545.

Yours very truly,

Mark L. Johnson
Director of Engineering

LS:ch/eng/env/08/dec/ Ernest Glover-DEIR Mid County Project

P.O. Box 1058 Coachella, CA 92236
Phone (760) 398-2651 Fax (760) 398-3711

December 22, 2008

Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Mid-County Project Area – Amendment No. 2, Garnet and West Garnet

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

SCH NO. 2008031016

URBAN FUTURES UFI / GRC

UFI | GRC Redevelopment Planning
3111 North Tustin Street, Suite 230
Orange, CA 92865
(714)283-9334 • FAX (714)283-5465
www.urbanfuturesinc.com

FINAL

PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

for the

Mid-County Project Area – Amendment No. 2, Garnet and West Garnet

(SCH NO. 2008031016)

December 22, 2008

Prepared for:
Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside
1325 Spruce Street, Suite 400,
Riverside, CA 92507
(951) 955-8916

Prepared by:

URBAN FUTURES INC./GRC
Redevelopment Planning
3111 North Tustin, Suite 230
Orange, CA 92865
714 283 9334

Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Mid-County Project Area – Amendment No. 2, Garnet and West Garnet

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

CHANGES TO THE PROJECT 3

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS 5

State of California Public Utilities Commission
- Letter 7
- Response 8

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM 9

TABLE OF FIGURES

REVISED AMENDMENT AREA LOCATION MAP 4

INTRODUCTION

This document, when combined with the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), constitutes the Final EIR (FEIR) for the proposed Mid-County Project Area – Amendment No. 2, Garnet and West Garnet, referred to herein as the "Project", pursuant to Section 15132 of the State of California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines ("CEQA Guidelines").

The DEIR contains a complete description of the proposed Project. The DEIR was circulated for public review and comment between from November 2, 2008 to December 17, 2008.

One agency submitted comments on the DEIR: State of California Public Utilities Commission.

Also contained in this FEIR is description of changes made to the Project and the Mitigation Monitoring Report for the Project.

The comment received did not identify new substantial impacts or require changes to the analyses or findings of the DEIR. The changes made involve the removal of the Cherry Valley Sub-Area from the Project, thereby reducing the size of the Amendment Area and potential impacts associated with its implementation. Therefore, there is no requirement to recirculate the DEIR.

CHANGES TO THE PROJECT

Following distribution of the DEIR for this document, concerns were raised by members of the community regarding the suitability of the Cherry Valley sub-area for inclusion in the Amendment Area. Although the redevelopment planning process identified conditions of blight in the Cherry Valley sub-area, the Agency agreed with community concerns that it is appropriate to address Garnet and West Garnet separate from Cherry Valley. Consequently, the Agency has removed Cherry Valley from the Amendment Area. The Agency will develop alternative strategies for addressing blighting conditions in Cherry Valley separate from the Mid-County Project Area – Amendment No. 2 for Garnet and West Garnet.

The removal of Cherry Valley from the Amendment Area results in the removal of 1,807.56 acres. This removal reduces the size of the Amendment Area from 4,511.88 acres to 2,704.32 acres. The sizes of the two remaining sub-areas remain the same: Garnet, consisting of 2,618.16 acres; and West Garnet, consisting of 86.16 acres.

The removal of Cherry Valley also results in the change to Figure 1 of the DEIR, Amendment Area Location Map (revised Figure 1 attached); the removal of Figure 2, Cherry Valley Boundary Map; and the subsequent renumbering of the balance of the DEIR figures.

Similarly, the removal of Cherry Valley results in the removal of Table 2, Cherry Valley – Existing Land Use & General Plan Land Use; and the subsequent renumbering of the balance of the DEIR tables.

This change to the Project results in a smaller Amendment Area. Because of the reduced size of the Amendment Area, there could fewer impacts associated with Project implementation. The change to the Project does not substantially alter the findings of the DEIR. It does not result in any changes to the mitigation measures presented in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no requirement to recirculate the DEIR.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

The comment letters and responses to the comments are included in this section. Each comment letter is provided, then a reiteration of the relevant comment, and a response to the relevant comment.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
320 WEST 4TH STREET, SUITE 500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Gove

RECEIVED
DEC 08 2008
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

December 5, 2008

Rohini Dasiki
Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside
1325 Spruce Street, Suite 400
Riverside, CA 92507

Dear Ms. Dasiki:

Re: SCH# 2008031016; Mid-County Redevelopment Project Amendment No. 2-Cherry Valley, Garnet, and West Garnet

The California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) has jurisdiction over the safety of highway-rail crossings (crossings) in California. The California Public Utilities Code requires Commission approval for the construction or alteration of crossings and grants the Commission exclusive power on the design, alteration, and closure of crossings.

The Commission's Rail Crossings Engineering Section (RCES) is in receipt of the *Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal-DIER* from the State Clearinghouse for the redevelopment project. RCES recommends that the County add language to the amendment plan so that any future planned development adjacent to or near the Union Pacific Railroad Company (not Southern Pacific, as mentioned on notice) right-of-way be planned with the safety of the rail corridor in mind. New developments may increase traffic volumes not only on streets and at intersections, but also at at-grade highway-rail crossings. This includes considering pedestrian circulation patterns/destinations with respect to railroad right-of-way.

Mitigation measures to consider include, but are not limited to, the planning for grade separations for major thoroughfares, improvements to existing at-grade highway-rail crossings due to increase in traffic volumes and continuous vandal resistant fencing or other appropriate barriers to limit the access of trespassers onto the railroad right-of-way.

If you have any questions, please contact Varouj Jinbachian, Senior Utilities Engineer at 213-576-7081, vsj@cpuc.ca.gov, or me at rxm@cpuc.ca.gov, 213-576-7078.

Sincerely,

Rosa Muñoz, PE
Utilities Engineer
Rail Crossings Engineering Section
Consumer Protection & Safety Division

C: Dan Miller, UPRR

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Section 15097 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires all state and local agencies to establish monitoring or reporting programs for projects approved by a public agency whenever approval involves the adoption of either a "mitigated negative declaration" or an EIR that proposes mitigation measures.

The following is the Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) for the Mid-County Project Area – Amendment No. 2, Garnet and West Garnet EIR. The intent of the MMP is to prescribe and enforce a means for properly and successfully implementing the mitigation measures as identified within the project EIR.

This MMP is intended to be used by Agency staff and mitigation monitoring personnel to ensure compliance with mitigation measures during project implementation.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting

The following MMP Table is the primary tool for implementing the MMP. The table includes a topical listing of all mitigation measures identified in the EIR. For each measure, the table identifies the party responsible for its implementation, the timing of its implementation, and the method for determining its implementation. The table is intended to serve as a checklist to assist the Agency with Project development and its ongoing implementation.

Each project applicant shall secure a signed verification for each of the mitigation measures, which indicates that mitigation measures have been complied with and implemented, and fulfills the Agency's environmental and other requirements. Final clearance shall require all applicable verification as included in the following table. The Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside will have primary responsibility for monitoring and reporting the implementation of the mitigation measures.

MITIGATION MEASURE	TIMING	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
			Monitoring Action:	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
TR-2: As part of its review of land development proposals, the County shall require project proponents to make a "fair share" contribution to required intersection and/or roadway improvements. The required intersection and/or roadway improvements shall be based on maintaining the appropriate level of service (LOS D within Community Development Areas designated by the 2002 Riverside County General Plan and within adjacent jurisdictions; LOS C within those portions of unincorporated Riverside County outside of Community Development Areas). The fair share contribution shall be based on the percentage of project-related traffic to the total future traffic.	During staff review of a proposed development project	Applicant, County Planning Department and Traffic Engineering staff	Review of project applications and preparation of Initial Studies and other environmental documentation as may be required	Planning Director; Traffic Engineer	
AIR QUALITY					
AQ-1: Future development proposals in the Amendment Area shall be subject to compliance with the established SCAQMD regulations, which may include air quality impact studies and subsequent CEQA analysis.	During staff review of a proposed development project	Applicant, County Planning Department staff	Review of project applications and preparation of Initial Studies and other environmental documentation as may be required	Planning Director	
AQ-2: Future development proposals in the Amendment Area shall include appropriate and feasible mitigation measures to address global warming as specified by County ordinance or, if no ordinance exists, as specified by relevant regulating authority, which could include mitigation measures provided by the Office of the California Attorney General.	During staff review of a proposed development project	Applicant, County Planning Department staff	Review of project applications and preparation of Initial Studies and other environmental documentation as may be required	Planning Director	

MITIGATION MEASURE	TIMING	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
			Monitoring Action:	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
HYDROLOGY					
HYD-1: Future development proposals in areas that are subject to flood hazards shall adhere to the flood proofing, flood protection requirements, and Flood Management Review requirements of the Riverside County Ordinance No. 458 Regulating Flood Hazard Areas.	During staff review of a proposed development project	Applicant, County Planning and Engineering Department staff	Review of project applications and preparation of Initial Studies and other environmental documentation as may be required	Planning Director; County Engineer	
HYD-2: Future development proposals in areas that are subject to flood hazards, surface ponding, high erosion potential, or sheet flow shall be submitted to the Coachella Valley Water District. Such developments shall not proceed until the District and County are satisfied that adequate flood abatement measures are in place.	During staff review of a proposed development project	Applicant, County Planning and Engineering Department staff	Review of project applications and preparation of Initial Studies and other environmental documentation as may be required	Planning Director; County Engineer	
PUBLIC SERVICES					
PS-1: Future development shall pay their fair share toward sheriff services and facilities as determined by the Sheriff Department and County.	During staff review of a proposed development project	Applicant, County Planning and Sheriff Department staff	Review of project applications and preparation of Initial Studies and other environmental documentation as may be required	Planning Director; County Sheriff	
PS-2: Future development shall pay their fair share toward fire protection services and facilities as determined by the Fire Department and County.	During staff review of a proposed development project	Applicant, County Planning and Fire Department staff	Review of project applications and preparation of Initial Studies and other environmental documentation as may be required	Planning Director; Fire Chief	

MITIGATION MEASURE	TIMING	IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
			Monitoring Action:	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
UTL-4: Future development shall comply with County requirements regarding NPDES requirements.	During staff review of a proposed development project	Applicant, County Planning Department and County Engineering staff	Review of project applications and preparation of Initial Studies and other environmental documentation as may be required	Planning Director; County Engineer	
UTL-5: Future development shall contribute its fair share to fund wastewater facilities as required by the County.	During staff review of a proposed development project	Applicant, County Planning Department and County Engineering staff	Review of project applications and preparation of Initial Studies and other environmental documentation as may be required	Planning Director; County Engineer	
UTL-6: Future development shall design storm drain improvements consistent with County policies.	During staff review of a proposed development project	Applicant, County Planning Department and County Engineering staff	Review of project applications and preparation of Initial Studies and other environmental documentation as may be required	Planning Director; County Engineer	
UTL-7: Future commercial, industrial and multifamily residential development shall provide adequate areas for the collection and loading of recyclable materials.	During staff review of a proposed development project	Applicant, County Planning Department and County Engineering staff	Review of project applications and preparation of Initial Studies and other environmental documentation as may be required	Planning Director; County Engineer	

October 27, 2008

Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Mid–County Project Area – Amendment No. 2, Cherry Valley Garnet, and West Garnet

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

URBAN FUTURES
UFI / GRC

UFI | GRC Redevelopment Planning
3111 North Tustin Street, Suite 230
Orange, CA 92865
(714)283-9334 • FAX (714)283-5465
www.urbanfuturesinc.com

DRAFT

PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

for the

Mid-County Project Area – Amendment No. 2, Cherry Valley, Garnet, and West Garnet

(SCH NO. 2008031016)

Prepared by:

URBAN FUTURES, INC.

In Cooperation with the:

Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside
1325 Spruce Street, Suite 400,
Riverside, CA 92507
(951) 955-8916

October 2008

❖ ❖ ❖

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

❖ ❖ ❖

Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Mid-County Project Area – Amendment No. 2, Cherry Valley, Garnet, and West Garnet

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE 1
1.0 SUMMARY 5
1.1 SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION 5
1.2 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES 5
1.3 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY 6
1.4 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED 6
1.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES 7
2.0 INTRODUCTION 11
2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT REQUIRED 11
2.2 PURPOSE, INTENT, AND SCOPE 11
2.2.1 INITIAL STUDY 11
2.2.2 NOTICE OF PREPARATION 12
2.2.3 SCOPE OF THE EIR 12
2.2.4 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT 15
2.3 MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM 16
2.4 PROJECT PROPONENT 16
2.5 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE 16
3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION 19
3.1 PROJECT LOCATION 19
3.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND 19
3.3 PROJECT GOALS 29
3.4 PLAN ACTIVITIES 30
3.4.1 RELATION TO GENERAL PLAN 32
3.5 EXISTING CONDITIONS 32
3.5.1 BLIGHTING CONDITIONS 33
3.5.2 BLIGHTING CONDITIONS IN THE AMENDMENT AREA 34
3.5.3 EXTENT OF URBANIZATION IN THE AMENDMENT AREA 42
3.5.4 EXISTING AND PROPOSED LAND USES IN THE AMENDMENT AREA 42

4.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES... 61
4.1 LAND USE AND PLANNING ... 61
4.1.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS ... 62
4.1.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE ... 67
4.1.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS ... 67
4.1.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ... 69
4.1.5 MITIGATION MEASURES ... 69
4.1.6 CONCLUSIONS ... 69
4.1.7 SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION ... 69
4.2 TRAFFIC ... 69
4.2.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS ... 69
4.2.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE ... 71
4.2.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS ... 71
4.2.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ... 72
4.2.5 MITIGATION MEASURES ... 73
4.2.6 CONCLUSIONS ... 73
4.2.7 SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION ... 73
4.3 AIR QUALITY ... 73
4.3.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS ... 73
4.3.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE ... 80
4.3.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS ... 80
4.3.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ... 84
4.3.5 MITIGATION MEASURES ... 84
4.3.6 CONCLUSIONS ... 85
4.3.7 SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION IMPACTS ... 85
4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES ... 85
4.4.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS ... 85
4.4.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE ... 88
4.4.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS ... 89
4.4.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ... 89
4.4.5 MITIGATION MEASURES ... 89
4.4.6 CONCLUSIONS ... 89
4.4.7 SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION ... 89
4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES ... 90
4.5.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS ... 90
4.5.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE ... 92
4.5.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS ... 92
4.5.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ... 93
4.5.5 MITIGATION MEASURE ... 93
4.5.6 CONCLUSIONS ... 93
4.5.7 SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION ... 93

4.6 HYDROLOGY 93
4.6.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS 93
4.6.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE 99
4.6.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS 99
4.6.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS 99
4.6.5 MITIGATION MEASURE 100
4.6.6 CONCLUSIONS 100
4.6.7 SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION 100
4.7 POPULATION AND HOUSING 100
4.7.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS 100
4.7.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE 101
4.7.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS 101
4.7.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS 102
4.7.5 MITIGATION MEASURE 102
4.7.6 CONCLUSIONS 102
4.7.7 SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION 102
4.8 PUBLIC SERVICES 102
4.8.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS 102
4.8.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE 106
4.8.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS 106
4.8.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS 109
4.8.5 MITIGATION MEASURE 109
4.8.6 CONCLUSIONS 109
4.8.7 SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION 109
4.9 UTILITIES 109
4.9.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS 109
4.9.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE 114
4.9.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS 115
4.9.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS 116
4.9.5 MITIGATION MEASURES 117
4.9.6 CONCLUSIONS 117
4.9.7 SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION 117
4.10 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES 117
4.10.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS 118
4.10.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE 118
4.10.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS 118
4.10.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS 119
4.10.5 MITIGATION MEASURES 120
4.10.6 CONCLUSIONS 120
4.10.7 SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION 120
5.0 LONG-TERM IMPACTS SUMMARY 121

5.1 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS 121
5.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY 122
5.3 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED 122
5.4 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE 123
5.5 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES 123

6.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT 125
6.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE 125
6.2 REDUCE REDEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT AREA SIZE 126
6.3 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE 126

7.0 INFORMATION SOURCES 129
7.1 BIBLIOGRAPHY 129
7.2 PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONTACTED 129
7.3 PREPARATION STAFF 129

8.0 LIST OF ACRONYMS 131

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1 – AMENDMENT AREA LOCATION MAP 21
FIGURE 2 – CHERRY VALLEY BOUNDARY MAP 23
FIGURE 3 – GARNET BOUNDARY MAP 25
FIGURE 4 – WEST GARNET BOUNDARY MAP 27
FIGURE 5 – CHERRY VALLEY EXISTING LAND USE MAP 45
FIGURE 6 – CHERRY VALLEY GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP 47
FIGURE 7 – GARNET EXISTING LAND USE MAP 51
FIGURE 8 – GARNET GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP 53
FIGURE 9 – WEST GARNET EXISTING LAND USE MAP 57
FIGURE 10 – WEST GARNET GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP 59
FIGURE 11 – FLOODING IN THE CHERRY VALLEY AREA 95
FIGURE 12 – FLOODING IN THE GARNET AREA 97

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES, AND STATUS AFTER MITIGATION 7
TABLE 2 CHERRY VALLEY – EXISTING LAND USE & GENERAL PLAN LAND USE 43
TABLE 3 GARNET – EXISTING LAND USE & GENERAL PLAN LAND USE 49
TABLE 4 WEST GARNET – EXISTING LAND USE & GENERAL PLAN LAND USE 55
TABLE 5 GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATIONS SUMMARY 63
TABLE 6 CURRENT FEDERAL AND STATE AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS 77
TABLE 7 ATTAINMENT STATUS FOR THE SCAB BASIN 79

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A INITIAL STUDY AND NOTICE OF PREPARATION
APPENDIX B CORRESPONDENCE

❖ ❖ ❖

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

❖ ❖ ❖

PREFACE

This document is a program-level Environmental Impact Report (the "EIR") prepared on behalf of the Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside (the "Agency") in accordance with the statutes and guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Section 21000 et seq. of the Public Resources Code and Section 15000 et seq. of Title 14 of the California Code Regulations, CEQA Guidelines, and Agency and County of Riverside ("County") requirements. The purpose of this EIR is to evaluate the potential environmental consequences of the activities necessary to implement the proposed Mid-County Project Area – Amendment No. 2, Cherry Valley, Garnet, and West Garnet (the "Project" or "Plan Amendment").

The Plan Amendment would add approximately 4,511.88 acres (the "Amendment Area") to the existing project area ("Existing Project Area") in the County of Riverside. The Amendment Area consists of three sub-areas: Cherry Valley, consisting 1,807.56 acres; Garnet, consisting of 2,618.16 acres; and West Garnet, consisting of 86.16 acres. The three sub-areas are located as follows:

- Cherry Valley is located generally south of Orchard Street, east of Taylor Road, west of Bellflower Avenue and generally north of Cougar Way.
- Garnet is located generally south of Pierson Boulevard, generally east of Serendipity Road, generally east of Avenida Monte Flora, and generally north of 20th Avenue.
- West Garnet is located south of Garnet Avenue, generally east of Kellogg Road, generally west of Diablo, and north of the Southern Pacific Transportation Corridor and Whitewater River.

The adoption and implementation of a redevelopment plan, or redevelopment plan amendment, is classified as a project pursuant to CEQA. This document evaluates the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the Project at a level of detail comparable to that described in the policies and implementation measures of the Project.

Program EIR

Section 21090 of the Public Resources Code specifies that an environmental impact report for a redevelopment plan may be a master environmental impact report, program environmental impact report, or a project environmental impact report. This EIR is a program EIR. The determination to prepare a program EIR was made by the Agency consistent with Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, which state that a program EIR may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either: (1) geographically, (2) a logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions, (3) in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program, or (4) as individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways.

In accordance with Section 15146 of the CEQA Guidelines, the level of detail in this EIR corresponds to the level of detail in the Plan Amendment[1]. Because the Project does not propose specific development activities and does not propose any land use or activity that is not

[1] Section 15146 and 15146 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

in compliance with the County General Plan, this document focuses on the secondary effects that could occur if the Plan Amendment were adopted and implemented. Consequently, the level of detail in this document is not as detailed as a project specific EIR.

Subsequent activities of the Plan Amendment would be examined in the light of this program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared. Because the timing and scope of future improvement projects to be undertaken with Agency funds in the Amendment Area are not known at this time, subsequent projects would likely require additional environmental analyses.

EIR Focus

The focus of this EIR analysis is the potential physical changes that could occur in the Amendment Area should the Project be adopted. Future development assumptions used for this analysis are based on the County of Riverside Integrated Project (the "RCIP"), which is a comprehensive, three-part, integrated program to determine future conservation, transportation and housing and economic needs in Riverside County. It consists of the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), Community & Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP), and the County General Plan (General Plan).

Pursuant to State law[2], the Project must be consistent with General Plan and applicable RCIP policies. Upon its adoption, the Project would be a tool for implementing the provisions of each of the three RCIP components.

Adoption and implementation of the proposed Plan Amendment is expected to facilitate the continued improvement of the Existing Project Area, which was originally established through the Redevelopment Plan (the "Existing Plan") for the Mid-County Redevelopment Project Area[3] in 1986. CEQA analyses prepared and subsequently approved for the Existing Plan assessed the potentially significant impacts of redevelopment on the Existing Project Area. The proposed Plan Amendment is not expected to result in potentially significant adverse changes to the Existing Project Area. Consequently, this EIR analysis does not address potential changes to the Existing Project Area that could result from the Project.

EIR Process

In accordance with CEQA, the Agency has chosen to serve as the lead public agency responsible for overseeing the EIR process and approving the Project. The Agency distributed a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") advising others that an EIR would be prepared and listing the issues to be studied. The purpose of the NOP was to solicit comments on the scope and content of the EIR. A copy of the NOP, accompanying Initial Study and distribution list is found in Appendix A of this document. Those receiving copies of the NOP had 30 days to respond; the response period was from March 4, 2008 through April 2, 2008. Five written comments regarding the NOP were submitted to the Agency. These comments were from Riverside County Fire Department, Native American Heritage Commission, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), City of Calimesa and Riverside County Waste Management Department.

---

2 State of California Community Redevelopment Law (Health and Safety Code 33000 *et seq.*).

3 The Mid-County Redevelopment Project Area consists of the 3-1986, 3-1987, and 3-1989 Redevelopment Projects, which were merged together in 1999. The earliest project, 3-1986, was adopted in 1986.