UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER TRIBUTARIES RESTORATION PROJECT INITIAL STUDY

PREPARED FOR:

San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District
380 East Vanderbilt Way
San Bernardino, CA 92408
Contact: Heather Dyer, Water Resources Project Manager
Email: comments@sbvmwd.com

PREPARED BY:

ICF
1250 Corona Pointe Court, Suite 406
Corona, CA 92879
Contact: Debra Leight, Project Manager

Stillwater Sciences
Wendy Katagi, CEP
Senior Manager
Watershed and Ecosystem Restoration Services
555 W. 5th Street, 35th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90013

July 2018

ICF and Stillwater Sciences. 2018. Upper Santa Ana River Tributaries Restoration Project *Initial Study*. Administrative Draft. July. (ICF Project Number 96.18).....

Contents

Table

Table **Page**

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AB	Assembly Bill
amsl	above mean sea level
AQMP	air quality management plan
Basin	South Coast Air Basin
bi	Mesozoic basic intrusive rocks
BMP	Business and Manufacturing Park Zone
BMPs	Best Management Practices
C	Commercial
CAAQS	California ambient air quality standards
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
cfs	cubic feet per second
CH_4	Methane
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CO_2	carbon dioxide
Construction General Permit	California State Water Resources Control Board's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Constructions and Land Disturbance Activities
CUPA	Certified Unified Program Agency
dB	decibels
EOP	Emergency Operations Plan
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHG	Greenhouse gases
gr	granitic rock
gra	granite and adamellite
grg	Granodiorite
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
LHMP	Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
MDR	Multi Density Residential
MSHCP	Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
MRZ-3	Mineral resource zone
N_20	nitrous oxide
NO_x	Oxides of nitrogen
NAAQS	national ambient air quality standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission

NOP	Notice of Preparation
O_3	ozone
OS	Open Space
OS-CH	Open Space Conservation Habitat
OS-R	Open Space and Recreation
OS-W	Water
PF	Public Facilities
PM	particulate matter
PM_{10}	PM less than 10 microns
$PM_{2.5}$	less than 2.5 microns in diameter
Qal	alluvium
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RE	Residential Estate Zone
ROG	Reactive organic gases
RPU	Riverside Public Utilities Department
RRWQCP	Regional Water Quality Treatment Plant
SAR	Santa Ana River
SB	Senate Bill
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
Scoping Plan	Climate Change Scoping Plan
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
TRI	Toxic Release Inventory
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Valley District	San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District
W-1	Watercourse, Watershed, and Conservation Areas
WMWD	Western Municipal Water District
WRCRWA	Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 1
Environmental Checklist

1.	**Project Title:**	Upper Santa Ana River Tributaries Restoration Project
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:**	San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District 380 East Vanderbilt Way San Bernardino, CA 92408
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number:**	Heather Dyer, Water Resources Project Manager
4.	**Project Location:**	Anza Creek/Old Ranch Creek and Hole Creek are located entirely within the City of Riverside, while Hidden Valley Creek is in the City of Riverside and the City of Jurupa Valley. As shown in Figure 1 in the proposed project description, all four sites are located in the northwestern portion of Riverside County and along or within the Santa Ana River. Figure 2 in the proposed project description provides a more detailed view of the project location. The restoration sites of Hidden Valley Creek and Hole Creek are located west of the intersection of the Santa Ana River and Van Buren Boulevard, while the Anza Creek/Old Ranch Creek site is located north of Jurupa Avenue and Grand Avenue and west of Rubidoux Avenue.
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**	San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District 380 East Vanderbilt Way San Bernardino, CA 92408
6.	**General Plan Designation:**	Cross referencing the NOP/IS against the City of Riverside General Plan 2025, Land Use and Urban Design Element Figure LU-10, Land Use Policy Map (page 54) • ***Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek*** - City of Riverside Land use designation: P (Public Park) • ***Lower Hole Creek*** - City of Riverside Land use designations: (OS) Open Space, C (Commercial), MDR (Multi Density Residential) • ***Hidden Valley Creek -*** City of Riverside Land use designations: the creek is (OS) Open Space City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Land Use Designation (City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan, 2017), Figure 2-5 General Plan Land Use Plan 2017. • ***Hidden Valley Creek -*** City of Jurupa Valley Land use designations: (OS-W) Water, (OS-CH) Open Space Conservation Habitat, and (OS-R) Open Space and Recreation • ***Anza Creek, Old Ranch Creek and Hidden Valley Creek -*** Santa Ana River Overlay

7. Zoning:

The Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek restoration sites are zoned as PF (Public Facilities) by the City of Riverside.

The Lower Hole Creek restoration site has the following City of Riverside zoning designations: PF (Public Facilities), BMP (Business and Manufacturing Park Zone), and RE (Residential Estate Zone).

The Hidden Valley Creek restoration site has the following City of Riverside zoning designation: PF (Public Facilities). The site has the following City of Jurupa Valley zoning designation: W-1 (Watercourse, Watershed, and Conservation Areas).

8. Description of Project:

The San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (Valley District) proposes to construct and maintain four tributary restoration sites in Riverside County (proposed project). The four restoration sites are: Anza Creek, Old Ranch Creek, Lower Hole Creek, and Hidden Valley Creek. The sites would be designed to provide improved habitat for endangered and/or threatened species and improve conditions of jurisdictional aquatic resources. The main restoration efforts at the sites would include restoration and enhancement of existing channels, creation of new channels, restoration of an existing floodplain tributary, enhancements to existing riparian and floodplain habitats, limiting of human disturbance, and control of nonnative invasive species.

The proposed project is a concerted effort by Valley District to initiate environmental compliance efforts and to implement conservation measures given their need to develop water supply projects in response to the increasing demands and potential reduced water supply reliability in the Upper Santa Ana River watershed. The purpose is to provide improved habitat for endangered and/or threatened species and to improve conditions of aquatic resources. The protection of these resources also provides recreational opportunities for the public, such as hiking, fishing of predatory fish, and wildlife viewing. In addition, restoration of endangered and/or threatened species habitat and aquatic resources may aid the water agencies in establishing and identifying compensatory mitigation options that can later be used to obtain necessary permits for water management activities.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek restoration sites are approximately 321 acres combined and are located on the Santa Ana River's south floodplain about 2 miles downstream of Mount Rubidoux. The Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek sites are bounded to the north by the Santa Ana River, to the east by the closed Tequesquite Landfill, and to the south and west by the Santa Ana River bicycle trail and Anza Narrows Park. Single-family homes are located beyond the Santa Ana River bicycle trail to the south of the site.

The proposed Lower Hole Creek restoration site would be located to the west of Van Buren Boulevard, south of the Santa Ana River, and north and east of the single-family housing developments located along Lower Hole Creek. The primary land use south and west of the restoration site is single-family residences. Commercial buildings and the continuation of Lower Hole Creek are also located south of the restoration site. The primary land use to the east is the Van Buren Golf Center and the Santa Ana River is located north of the restoration site. The site is divided by Jurupa Avenue into two adjacent project areas—Upper Hole Creek and Lower Hole Creek.

The proposed Hidden Valley Creek restoration site is located on the inside of a meander bend on the south side of the Santa Ana River. Van Buren Boulevard is to the west, the Santa Ana River trail is to the north, and Kennedy Street is to the south of the restoration site. The primary land uses to the north and south of the restoration site are single-family residences and open space. The land

use to the east and west of the restoration site is open space, as the Santa Ana River is located to the east and west of the site.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

City of Riverside, County of Riverside Flood Control encroachment permits, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers aquatic resource permits, Regional Water Quality Control Board permits, landowner access agreement.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code Section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code Section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code Section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

Native American consultation will be conducted in accordance with Section 106, AB 52, and Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. Formal consultation has begun with tribes previously requesting consultation. This process is ongoing.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

☐ Aesthetics	☒ Agricultural and Forestry	☒ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources	☒ Cultural Resources	☒ Geology/Soils/Paleo
☒ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒ Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☒ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☒ Noise
☒ Population/Housing	☐ Public Services	☒ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic	☒ Tribal Cultural Resources	☒ Utilities/Service Systems
☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance		

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find 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 to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have an impact on the environment that is "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" 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.

☐ I find 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 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Heather Pace Dyer
Signature

7/7/18
Date

Heather Pace Dyer
Printed Name

San Bernardino Valley MWD
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 if 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 offsite as well as onsite, 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, 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 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a "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 Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)
5. Earlier analyses may be used if, pursuant to 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 earlier analyses are available for review.
    b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
    c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that 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, when 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. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. 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 a less-than-significant level.

I. Aesthetics	Potentially Significant to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

The proposed project's four restoration sites are located within the Santa Ana River floodplain. According to the City of Riverside General Plan, the Santa Ana River watercourse and riverbed is described as a prominent scenic resource extending along the City's northern boundary. "The Santa Ana River is a place of natural beauty…a place of significant natural habitat for many species of birds and other animals, as well as being a prominent visual landmark for visitors and residents." (City of Riverside General Plan EIR, 2007). As described in the City of Jurupa Draft General Plan, the proposed project is located along the southern boundary of Jurupa Valley where the Santa Ana River represents a significant recreational, habitat, and visual resource.

However, as detailed in the project description, portions of the proposed project area are heavily used by humans including recreational day-users and the homeless. Homeless encampments have been observed throughout the project area.

Views of the Santa Ana River floodplain from neighboring residential areas and Santa Ana River Trail are also described in the City of Riverside and Jurupa Valley General Plans as 'scenic'. Within and adjacent to the proposed project area, Van Buren Boulevard is identified in the City of Jurupa General Plan as a scenic corridor.

Anza Creek and Hidden Valley Creek sites are within the City of Jurupa Valley Santa Ana River Corridor. The Santa Ana River is an integral part of the City's and the region's multi-purpose open space and trail systems. It includes the Santa Ana River Trail, a national recreation trail designated within this corridor that, upon completion, will incorporate 110 miles of trail system from San Bernardino County in the north to Orange County in the south. Beyond that, the Santa Ana River is the centerpiece of a massive 2,650-square-mile watershed that involves major portions of three counties. The river drains southwest toward Prado Dam, and serves as a prominent natural buffer between Jurupa and the cities of Riverside and Norco. Several natural and channelized drainage courses connect with the river. In addition to their fundamental water-related functions, these watercourses provide corridors through developed land and link open spaces together. Among

other things, this creates biologically essential wildlife corridors that allow wildlife to move from one open space to another without crossing streets, highways, or developed land.

Discussion

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

As detailed in the project description, the proposed project involves restoration activities at four site locations. According to the City of Riverside General Plan EIR Aesthetics section, "The most notable scenic vistas in the City include the La Sierra/Norco Hills, Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park, and Box Springs Mountain Regional Park." Since the Santa Ana River and floodplain are visible from these scenic vistas, the four restoration sites included in the proposed project would also be visible from these scenic vistas. Proposed restoration activities at the four sites would include invasive plant removal, removal of homeless encampments, native habitat plantings, and stream restoration such that in the long-term, public views of the sites would include views of restored native habitat instead of degraded habitat including invasive plant species and homeless encampments throughout the project area (City of Riverside General Plan EIR, 2007). The proposed project is also located within the City of Jurupa Valley. The City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan designates the Hidden Valley Creek site as a scenic resource within the Santa Ana River Overlay zone. The proposed project includes restoration activities to enhance habitat within the Santa Ana River Overlay zone. Therefore, the proposed project would improve scenic vistas compared with existing conditions.

During construction activities, scenic vistas of the project site would not be substantially impacted due to the short-term, phased nature of the activities and no substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista would occur.

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

According to the City of Riverside General Plan, Figure 5.1-1, Van Buren Boulevard is designated as a scenic boulevard and intersects with the proposed project location (City of Riverside General Plan EIR, 2007). There are no state designated scenic highways in the surrounding area of the project site. Restoration of native habitat, as well as the removal of homeless encampments and associated refuse, would enhance the views from Van Buren Boulevard as it passes through the proposed project site. Views of trees and rock outcroppings from Van Buren Boulevard would be improved through the implementation of this project. The views of the project site from Van Buren Boulevard during construction would not be significantly impacted as construction would be phased and short-term as described in the project description. Additionally, there are no historic buildings located within the project site that would be directed affected by project restoration activities (other known cultural resources will be evaluated in the EIR). Therefore, scenic resources along the designated scenic boulevards would not be damaged. Due to short-term construction-related impacts to scenic resources the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact.

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Restoration activities would result in beneficial effects to the existing visual character and visual quality of the site and its surroundings. The site is currently a natural but disturbed area, with large areas of invasive species. The Santa Ana River floodplain's native habitat is considered a scenic visual resource. Through the removal of invasive species and restoration of native habitat the existing visual character and quality of the site would be improved.

Removal of trash, debris, and homeless encampments would improve visual character and visual quality of the project site. The presence of homeless encampments and the effects of encampments on the visual character of the site is a complex societal problem. Implementation of this project would require the collaboration of Riverside City Services and other stakeholder agencies to ensure that the homeless population in the proposed project site would not be relocated to an adjacent natural area. The result of the project would ultimately improve the visual quality of the site and its surroundings through the removal of the existing homeless encampments and trash found throughout the project site.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

The proposed project does not include the construction of any structures or lighting in the project area. Construction-related activities would be conducted during daytime hours. No light and glare impacts would be created by the proposed project and no adverse effect due to lighting or glare would occur.

II. Agricultural and Forestry Resources	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
In determining whether impacts on 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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts on forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project, and 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

The proposed project site is designated as Parks and Open Space area per the City of Riverside General Plan 2025 (2007). The Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek sites are adjacent to an area

designated as "Farmland of local importance" along Grand Avenue (Figure 5.2-1 City of Riverside General Plan EIR, 2007). The Hidden Valley Creek and Lower Hole Creek areas of the proposed project are neither within nor adjacent to Farmland resources. According to the City of Jurupa Draft General Plan, a portion of the Hidden Valley Creek site is designated as Unique Farmlands (Figure 4.13 of the City of Jurupa Draft General Plan, 2017). However, the Jurupa Valley zoning for the site is W-1 (Watercourse, Watershed, and Conservation Areas). City of Jurupa Valley Land use designations are (OS-W) Water, (OS-CH) Open Space Conservation Habitat, and (OS-R) Open Space and Recreation. The Anza Creek, Old Ranch Creek, and Hidden Valley Creek restoration sites are located within the City of Jurupa Valley Santa Ana River Overlay.

The entirety of the proposed project is not within areas designated as forest land.

Discussion

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?

The entirety of the proposed project areas lie within areas designated as Parks and Open Space and as such would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, of Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use (The City of Riverside General Plan 2025, 2007). The Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek areas of the proposed project are adjacent to an area of farmland of local importance (Figure 5.2-1 City of Riverside General Plan EIR, 2007). As described in the Affected Environment section above, the proposed project is not zoned as farmland in the City of Jurupa Zoning Ordinance. However, a portion of the Hidden Valley Creek site is designated Unique Farmlands (Figure 4.13 of the City of Jurupa Draft General Plan, 2017). The restoration of native habitat and the removal of invasive species as detailed in the project description would provide beneficial effects to this area of farmland of local importance/"Unique Farmland" by removing a neighboring source of noxious weeds that disrupt agricultural practices. Therefore, no impact to farmland would be expected, however, additional review of the proposed project's impact on potential land designated as or used for farmland will be provided in the EIR.

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965--commonly referred to as the Williamson Act--enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments which are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value.

The implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. The Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek sites are zoned as PF (Public Facilities) by the City of Riverside. The Lower Hole Creek restoration site has the following City of Riverside zoning designations: PF, BMP (Business and Manufacturing Park Zone), and RE (Residential Estate Zone). The Hidden Valley Creek restoration site has the following City of Riverside zoning designation: PF. The site has the following City of Jurupa Valley zoning designation: W-1 (Watercourse, Watershed, and Conservation Areas). The project site and surrounding areas are designated as Open Space by the City of Riverside General Plan EIR (2007) and is within the Santa Ana River Overlay Zone according to the City of Jurupa Draft General Plan. Further, there are no

Williamson Act contracts on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

As discussed in Section b. above, the project site is not located in an area zoned as forest land, timberland, or a Timberland Production Zone and would not conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland. The proposed project would therefore have no impact on forest land or timberland.

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

As stated above, the project site is not located within an area designated as forest land, timberland, or a Timberland Production zone. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

e. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, 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?

As discussed above, the implementation of the proposed project would not result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

III. Air Quality	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
When available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Affected Environment

Air quality management agencies of direct importance in Riverside County are the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Air Resources Board (CARB), and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). EPA has established federal air quality standards for which the CARB and SCAQMD have primary implementation responsibility. The CARB and SCAQMD are also responsible for ensuring that state air quality standards are met.

The proposed project's four restoration sites are located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), which includes all of Orange County and the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. The Basin is bounded to west by the Pacific Ocean and to the north and east by the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains. Within the Basin, ozone (O_3) and particulate matter (PM) less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$), and PM less than 10 microns (PM_{10}) are the pollutants of primary concern. Both federal and state standards for ozone, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10} are not met in the Basin and the U.S. EPA has designated the Basin as a nonattainment area for these pollutants (SCAQMD 2017).

Within the Basin, O_3 and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$, particles less than 2.5 microns in diameter) are the pollutants of primary concern. Both federal and state standards for ozone, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10} are not met in the Basin and the U.S. EPA has designated the Basin as a nonattainment area for these pollutants (SCAQMD 2017).

The SCAQMD is responsible for establishing and enforcing local air quality rules and regulations that address the requirements of federal and state air quality laws, including the development and implementation of the air quality management plan (AQMP).

Discussion

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

The air quality plan relevant to the project is the 2016 AQMP, which outlines the SCAQMD's plans and control measures to attain the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) and California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS). Construction and long-term maintenance of the proposed project are expected to result in temporary emissions from construction equipment and there would be no change in long-term operational emissions. However, the EIR would address the impact of the project on air quality, and assess the project's compliance with the 2016 AQMP. This issue area will be analyzed in the EIR.

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

SCAQMD is required, pursuant to the federal and state Clean Air Acts, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the district is in nonattainment (i.e., O_3, $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}). Emissions related to the proposed project would be attributable to restoration construction activities as well as long-term maintenance. While it is anticipated that these emissions would not exceed state or federal air quality standards, the EIR would address the impact of the proposed restoration activities on air quality emissions, focusing on short-term and long-term emissions from construction and maintenance activities. This issue area will be analyzed in the EIR.

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

As noted above, the proposed project is located in an area that is designated as nonattainment for O_3, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10}. Short-term construction activities related to the proposed project would result in emissions of these pollutants, including precursors to O_3 (e.g. ROG and NO_x). Because of the short-term nature and minimal amount, it is not expected that the emissions would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of these pollutants. However, the EIR would address the impact of construction on emissions, and potential cumulatively considerable net increase of the criteria pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment. This issue area will be analyzed in the EIR.

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Sensitive receptors are facilities and structures where people live or spend considerable amounts of time, and include retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, and athletic facilities. The nearest sensitive receptors to the proposed project are residential homes on the south side of the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek sites, the south side of the Lower Hole Creek site, and the north side of the Hidden Valley Creek site. As described previously, emissions are anticipated from the construction and long-term maintenance of the

Proposed Project. However, because of the short duration, these emissions are not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The EIR air quality chapter would consider the restoration activities at the four tributaries (Anza, Lower Hole, Old Ranch, and Hidden Valley) and would address the impacts to sensitive receptors for short-term and long-term emissions from project construction and maintenance activities, including the impact of toxic air contaminants such as diesel particulate matter.

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

The construction of the proposed project may result in some odors due to construction equipment and earth moving activities. The minimal amount and temporary nature of these emissions is not anticipated to result in a project-specific or cumulatively considerable net increase of odors to a substantial number of people. Operations and maintenance activities associated with long-term management of the restoration areas are also expected to create some equipment-related (removal of invasive vegetation) odors in the project area and adjacent neighborhoods. Potential exposure of organic materials within the wetland areas could also generate odors due to decomposition, including release of hydrogen sulfide gas, which can have a "rotten egg" smell. The potential impact of the project to create objectionable odors would be assessed in the air quality chapter of the EIR.

IV. Biological Resources	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Wildlife 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, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Affected Environment

A comprehensive list of special-status species has been compiled for the project sites. Field verification, baseline habitat assessments, vegetation mapping, and rare plant surveys identified fourteen special status species that were either observed in or may occur in the project sites based on the presence of suitable habitat (Table 1).

Table 1. Special Status Species Observed in or with Suitable Habitat within the Project Area

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	
		Federal	State
Plants			
Santa Ana River woolly-star	*Eriastrum densifolium* ssp*. sanctorum*	Endangered	Endangered
Smooth tarplant	*Centromadia pungens* ssp.	None	1B
Fish			
Santa Ana sucker	*Catostomus santaanae*	Threatened	None
Arroyo chub	*Gila orcuttii*	None	SSC
Santa Ana speckled dace	*Rhinichthys osculus ssp.*	None	SSC
Amphibian and Reptiles			
Western pond turtle	*Actinemys marmorata*	None	SSC
Two striped garter snake	*Thamnophis sirtalis sp.*	None	SSC
Coast horned lizard	*Phrynosoma coronatum*	None	SSC
Birds			
Southwestern willow flycatcher	*Empidonax traillii extimus*	Endangered	Endangered
Least Bell's vireo	*Vireo bellii pusillus*	Endangered	Endangered
Western yellow-billed cuckoo	*Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*	Threatened	Endangered
Yellow-breasted chat	*Icteria virens*	None	SSC
Mammals			
Los Angeles little pocket mouse	*Perognathus longimembris brevinasus*	None	SSC
San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit	*Lepus californicus bennettii*	None	SSC

SSC = California Department of Fish and Wildlife Species of Special Concern

1B = California Rare Plant Rank 1B

(Source: ICF, Upper SAR Tributaries Opportunities and Constraints Final Report, 2018)

The affected environment of each of the restoration sites within the proposed project area is described below. For purposes of discussion the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek sites have been combined below.

Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek

The Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek sites currently support a variety of native vegetation communities including black willow/Fremont cottonwood forest, Fremont cottonwood/willow/wild grape forest, and Fremont cottonwood forest, with upland areas consisting mostly of arrow weed thickets and salt grass flats. The principal native plant species include arrow weed (*Pluchea sericea*), black willow (*Salix gooddingii*), Fremont's cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), and desert wild grape (*Vitis girdiana*). Based on its location and general conditions, Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek provide potential habitat for Santa Ana River woolly-star (*Eriastrum densifolium* ssp*. Sanctorum)*, and smooth tarplant (*Centromadia pungens* ssp.). Surveys and habitat assessments were performed for these species at the site and verified presence of suitable habitat for woolly-star (52.06 acres) and tarplant (23.55 acres), with a small population

of Santa Ana River woolly-star previously observed on site during a March 12, 2014 site visit (ICF 2018).

Nonnative plants are present throughout the site. Palms, including date palm (*Phoenix dactylifera*) and fan palm, are prevalent in the Fremont cottonwood communities. Salt cedar/tamarisk (*Tamarix* sp.) stands are found closer to the mainstem of the Santa Ana River. Extensive nonnative plant communities found on site include nonnative grassland and nonnative riparian habitat, dominated by palms.

Existing fish habitat is limited to a portion of the Anza Creek that supports perennial flows. Santa Ana suckers are occasionally observed in this channel after high-flow events (as recently as April 2016), but there are no documented occurrences of Santa Ana speckled dace (*Rhinichthys osculus ssp.)* or arroyo chub (*Gila orcuttii)* and no sensitive fish species were observed during site visits. Potential aquatic and upland habitat for both western pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata)* and two-striped garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis sp.)* is present throughout the site and is of variable quality.

Sensitive bird species documented at the site during field visits include least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus)*, willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus)*, yellow-breasted chat (*Icteria virens)*, and yellow warbler (*Setophaga petechia*). Riparian bird habitat was evaluated to be moderate to high quality throughout the site, with habitat quality depending largely on the amount of human disturbance and extent of nonnative vegetation.

No coast-horned lizard (*Phrynosoma coronatum*), Los Angeles pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris brevinasus*), or San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus bennettii*) were documented during site visits and there are no historical documented occurrences of these species at the site. The site does support small patches of potential habitat for these species, but its ability to support populations of these species is severely limited due to the intra-site patchiness of habitat and lack of connectivity to upland habitat in the region.

Lower Hole Creek

Dense riparian vegetation is present along most of the upstream half of Lower Hole Creek and becomes less abundant along the downstream reach. There are fringing wetlands dominated by emergent species present along portions of the creek, with more substantial emergent wetlands present at the confluence with the creek and the floodplain of the Santa Ana River. Native vegetation communities on the site include black willow thickets and California sycamore woodland along the creek channel, with upland areas consisting mostly of California annual grassland that is dominated by nonnative grasses. No sensitive plant species were observed during site visits, and the site does not currently support suitable habitat for any sensitive plant species. Nonnative invasive plants are present throughout the site including date and fan palm trees, giant reed (*Arundo donax*), ash (*Franxinus spp.*), and tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*) in addition to castor bean (*Ricinus communis*) and tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*).

Because the site does support perennial flows, there is habitat present for Santa Ana sucker and arroyo chub. Both species have been observed at the site, particularly after high-flow events that scour the channel and create more favorable bottom (substrate) conditions. Existing fish habitat in Lower Hole Creek is of moderate or poor quality due primarily to the prevalence of fine sediment and presence of aquatic invasive species. Habitat for western pond turtle and two-striped garter snake is also present at the site, but of varying quality primarily as a result of high human

disturbance (trash, encampments) and nonnative invasive species. Neither western pond turtle nor two-striped garter snake was observed during the site visit on August 1, 2016.

One male least Bell's vireo was repeatedly detected at the Lower Hole Creek site during riparian bird surveys conducted between May 16 and July 13, 2016, suggesting presence of an active territory. However, a female was not detected and it is not known whether this male was paired. Habitat quality for riparian birds was moderate to poor due to the high degree of human disturbance and lack of native riparian shrub understory.

The Lower Hole Creek site lacks suitable habitat for Los Angeles pocket mouse and coast horned lizard, due to compacted soils and very dense undergrowth. The small amount of habitat are present for black-tailed jackrabbit is of poor quality due to the small, sparse shrub cover. None of these species were observed during site visits.

Hidden Valley Creek

The Hidden Valley Creek site is composed of a series of native riparian and floodplain vegetation communities including California buckwheat scrub, cattail marsh, Fremont cottonwood forest, Fremont cottonwood/willow forest, Fremont cottonwood/willow/mulefat forest, Fremont cottonwood/willow/wild grape forest, mulefat thickets, and sandbar willow thickets, with upland areas consisting mostly of California annual grassland, which is dominated by nonnative grasses. The principal plant species on the site include western sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), blue elderberry (*Sambucus nigra* ssp. *caerulea*), and mulefat (*Baccharis salicifolia*). Dominant nonnative vegetation consists of giant reed and common poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*). Based on its location and general conditions, the Hidden Valley Creek site could potentially provide habitat for Santa Ana River woolly-star. Surveys and habitat assessments were performed on July 18, 19, and 20, 2016 and September 29, 2016 for this species at the site and verified suitable habitat conditions for the woolly-star in areas currently vegetated by California annual grassland. No sensitive plant species were observed during site visits, and the site does not currently support suitable habitat for any other sensitive plant species.

Because the Santa Ana River at this site does not now support perennial flows, there is currently no habitat for Santa Ana sucker or arroyo chub, but arroyo chub has historically been seen within the wetted channel at the site. The Hidden Valley Creek pond appears to provide high-quality aquatic habitat for both western pond turtle and two-striped garter snake, although neither of these species were observed. The water appeared to be of sufficient depth to provide cover, and cattails and willows provide cover in shallow water. The pond is large enough that its surface receives direct sunlight, allowing for basking opportunities on exposed logs. The surrounding upland habitat to the northwest within the Santa Ana River floodplain is also of high quality, with a combination of dense willow vegetation, arrow weed scrub, and open sandy areas where the river channel formerly ran. Conversely, habitat quality for western pond turtle and two-striped garter snake is marginally suitable in the southeastern portions of the site due to an extensive riparian overstory and dense understory. Habitat quality is also marginal at the eastern edge of the site due to extensive human use of the area.

Least Bell's vireos make abundant use of the Hidden Valley Creek site. Surveyors detected 37 least Bell's vireo territories at the site, with paired birds known to be breeding at 12 of the territories; only a singing male was detected at each of the other 25 territories. In addition, two non-federally listed willow flycatchers were detected on May 23, 2016 at the Hidden Valley Creek site. There were also detections of 34 other bird species, including two state species of special concern, the yellow-

breasted chat and yellow warbler. Riparian habitat quality at the site was generally good, with a speciose, structurally diverse native vegetation community at most sample points. Human disturbance is a limitation in some parts of the site, but is less of an issue than at the Anza Creek, Old Ranch Creek, and Lower Hole Creek sites reviewed, with high levels of disturbance confined to a small portion of the site.

The Hidden Valley Creek site also provides habitat for Los Angeles pocket mouse, coast horned lizard, and black-tailed jackrabbit. However, habitat is limited due to the extensive riparian vegetation cover, which is unsuitable for these species; open areas providing suitable habitat were largely limited to disturbed areas and portions of the river channel, neither of which provides high-quality habitat. Some areas have fine, loose soils suitable for coast horned lizard, but very few ants (an important food source for coast horned lizard) were observed within areas of suitable habitat. Development on adjacent uplands, limiting habitat connectivity, also constrain the site's potential as habitat for these three species.

Discussion

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

As detailed in the Project Description section, the proposed project would create or enhance habitat for multiple listed species through restoration of four Santa Ana River tributary sites. Overall, the proposed project is expected to result in a net gain in aquatic, riparian, and terrestrial habitat to support the special status species listed in Table 1. To ensure the project goals for enhancing habitat are met, dynamic conditions within the Santa Ana River (e.g., flooding, wildfires, heavy debris flows, etc.) and the potential for impacts on special-status species will be addressed in the EIR.

Temporary construction-related effects could potentially impact special-status species and/or their associated habitat. During active construction, these impacts could include temporary habitat loss or degradation, interference with foraging/feeding behavior, and interference with migration. These impacts would be potentially significant and may require mitigation. The EIR will address construction-related impacts to biological resources.

b. Have a substantial adverse effect 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?

As described in the Project Description section, the proposed project would create or enhance ecologically important riparian, floodplain, and alkali meadow habitat through restoration of four Santa Ana River tributary sites.

Temporary construction-related effects would potentially impact riparian or other sensitive natural communities. These temporary impacts are likely to include clearing, grubbing, and grading to create temporary access roads for heavy equipment as well as excavation during riparian and floodplain enhancement actions. Channel and floodplain enhancement/restoration activities may remove small sections of native riparian and floodplain vegetation, potentially resulting in adverse impacts due to reductions in habitat quantity or suitability for native species. Although the proposed project would result in a net gain in riparian, floodplain, and alkali meadow habitat, the temporary

loss or degradation of habitat would be potentially significant and may require mitigation. This impact will be analyzed in more detail in the EIR.

c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

The site supports aquatic resources, including waters and wetlands, that are under federal and state jurisdiction as regulated by the USACE, SWRCB or RWQCB, and CDFW. Although much of the proposed restoration work would improve wetland conditions, there is a potential for conflicts with restoration targeting native fish in the form of temporary impacts on jurisdictional resources (wetlands and waters) or resource conversion (wetlands to waters). These impacts would be potentially significant and may require mitigation. Impacts to wetlands will be analyzed in more detail in the EIR.

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?

Fish

Instream habitat enhancement activities including large wood placement, channel contouring, and other in-water work are expected to temporarily dewater stream channel segments which may result in temporary relocation or displacement of special-status native fish species. However, baseline surveys found Santa Ana suckers to be uncommon in the restoration areas while other special status fish species (i.e., arroyo chub and Santa Ana speckled dace) have not been observed in recent surveys. Interference with the movement of fish would be temporary and overall the project is expected to increase aquatic habitat connectivity and allow for wider fish movement through channel enhancement actions and flow restoration. Nevertheless, these impacts would be potentially significant and may require mitigation. The EIR will address potentially significant impacts to native fish species.

Wildlife

Riparian and forested sections within the restoration areas provide suitable habitat for special status birds and terrestrial wildlife species. Temporary impacts to wildlife movement may occur during active construction periods when noise and disturbance associated with construction activities could cause species to temporarily avoid the restoration areas. Construction activities could disrupt migratory birds and raptors with active nests near the construction areas potentially leading to nest abandonment by adult birds or forced fledging of young. These impacts would be potentially significant and may require mitigation. The EIR will address potentially significant impacts to wildlife species due to construction-related activities.

The proposed project is located in a dynamic natural system subject to natural and man-made wildfire (such as arson or unintended incidents) as well as heavy storm flow and flooding. The EIR will address impacts to biological resources associated with wildfire and flood, and impacts on the movement of native fish and wildlife.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Ordinance No. 559 Regulating the Removal of Trees (Riverside County), Section 1 states, "No person shall remove any living native tree on any parcel or property greater than one-half acre in size, located in an area above 5,000 feet in elevation and within the unincorporated area of the County of Riverside, without first obtaining a permit to do so, unless exempted by the provisions of Section 4 of this ordinance.

The proposed project actions would not occur in any areas above 5,000 feet in elevation. Therefore, no conflicts with local tree preservation policies or ordinances are anticipated under the proposed project.

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?

The proposed project is intended to align with the provisions, goals, and objectives of the Upper SAR HCP and also to align with adopted conservation plans such as the Western Riverside MSHCP. As such, the proposed project would be expected to be consistent with these adopted plans. However, short term construction activities could result in potentially significant impacts on listed species and their habitat. Therefore, the EIR will address the proposed project's short-term and long-term potential to conflict with anticipated provisions of the adopted plans. Long term maintenance activities associated with the proposed project will also be addressed in the EIR.

V. Cultural Resources	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Affected Environment

As detailed in the Project Description section, the proposed project is located mostly within the City of Riverside with the Hidden Valley Creek site also within the City of Jurupa Valley, and more specifically within the Santa Ana River floodplain. According to the City's General Plan EIR, many tribal territories converged in the fertile valleys and canyons fed by the Santa Ana River and its tributaries and sheltered by Mount Rubidoux and the Box Springs Mountains. Included in the tribal groups are the Gabrieliños, the Cahuilla, and the Serrano Indians, and possibly the Luiseño Indians, who had inhabited the area for many hundreds, if not thousands, of years. Prehistoric and ethnohistoric archaeological sites likely to be found within the proposed project vicinity include: villages represented by residential bases with house features (stone and/or adobe), storage features, human burials and cremations, rock art (pictographs and/or petroglyphs); temporary encampments represented by flaked and ground stone scatters with fire hearths and possibly storage features; resource procurement and processing sites represented by bedrock milling stations, tool stone quarries, flaked and ground stone artifact scatters, and/or hunting blinds; trails demarked by cairns and possibly rock art; isolated cultural features such as rock art, intaglios, and/or shrines; isolated flaked or ground stone artifacts; and traditional cultural landscapes/sacred places that may include important gathering or collecting places, springs, mountain tops or rock outcroppings, and burial grounds.

Discussion

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

A search of the sacred lands records files revealed no Sacred Lands or traditional cultural properties in proximity to the proposed project area. Based on review of available data, known historic structures may exist in the proposed project area, including historic canals and water features. As such, a cultural resources analysis will be prepared to determine known resources and the potential impact to historical resources as defined in Section 15064.5. Since there are known historic canals and water features along with structures apparent in aerial photographs, the EIR will address

potential significant impacts to historical resource(s). Therefore, impacts related to historical resources as defined in Section 15064.5 will be discussed in the EIR.

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

According to the City of Riverside's General Plan EIR and Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element, the proposed project area may include archaeological resources as the proposed project falls within an area identified with high archaeological sensitivity (per Figure 5.5-1 of the City of Riverside General Plan EIR Cultural Resources Section). The proposed project would include restoration activities in the Santa Ana River floodplain. As such, the proposed project could result in impacts to archaeological resources that would be potentially significant. The EIR will provide the results of a records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) for a half-mile radius surrounding the proposed restoration areas. The record search will provide background information on any previously conducted studies and previously recorded cultural resources in the area. Limited local archival research will be conducted to gather information about the project vicinity.

The EIR will include outreach to Native Americans, including the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local Native American representatives, to invite any comment on the project as it relates to cultural resources. A cultural resources survey and analysis will be prepared that describes the records search, background research, prehistoric, ethnographic, and historical contexts, field methods, findings and recommendations and will be discussed in the EIR.

c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

There are no known Native American burial sites within the area of proposed disturbance. However, the proposed project is located in an area described in the Riverside General Plan EIR and City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan with high archaeological sensitivity as well as paleontological resources (Conservation and Open Space Element Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan, 2017). The EIR will address cultural resources and any potential disturbance to human remains.

VI. Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. 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.	☐	☐	☐	☒
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4. Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Affected Environment

The proposed project is located mostly within the City of Riverside which lies within the northern end of the Peninsular Ranges, approximately 12 miles south of the intersection with the Transverse Range. The Santa Ana Mountains are approximately 15 miles south and southwest of the City of Riverside, while the San Jacinto Mountains are approximately 10 miles east and northeast of the City of Riverside. The San Bernardino Mountains are about 20 miles north of the City. A series of hills and

small mountains surround the project area. These hills and mountains are between the two dominant San Jacinto and Santa Ana mountain ranges. They include La Sierra/Norco Hills, Mt. Rubidoux, Box Springs Mountains, Sycamore Canyon, and the many smaller ranges south of the City. Within the City of Riverside, surface elevations range from about 700 feet above mean sea level (amsl) near the Santa Ana River to over 1,400 feet amsl west of La Sierra. The highest point in the southern portion of the City of Riverside's Sphere of Influence as defined by the General Plan is Arlington Mountain, standing at 1,853 feet amsl approximately 1.5 miles northwest of Lake Mathews. Additionally, portions of Box Springs Mountain Reserve located in the northern portion of the City of Riverside's Sphere of Influence area extend as high as 2,000 feet.

The proposed project area and the hills in the project vicinity are made up of granite and adamellite (gra), mesozoic granitic rock (gr), granodiorite(grg), mesozoic basic intrusive rocks (bi), and alluvium (Qal) (located around the Santa Ana River). Most date from the Mesozoic period, except for the alluvium, which dates from the Quaternary.

No Fault-Rupture Hazard Zone, as designated by the California Department of Conservation, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (1999) exists within the proposed project area. However, the City of Riverside is located in a region with several active fault lines including the San Jacinto and Elsinore faults. The San Andreas fault lies in the County of San Bernardino northeast of the project site (City of Riverside General Plan 2025 EIR, 2007).

According to the City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan, there are no known seismic faults within Jurupa Valley, nor is Jurupa Valley located within a mapped Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. While the potential earthquake risk is considered low, regional faults such as the Rialto-Colton, San Jacinto, and Chino Faults pose earthquake risks to the West Riverside County area, including Jurupa Valley. Most of Jurupa Valley has a high groundwater table and is considered to have a "High" liquefaction potential. While a general risk of liquefaction potential can be provided based on soil type and groundwater depth, site-specific geotechnical studies are the only practical and reliable way of determining the specific liquefaction potential of a site. Seismically induced landslides and rock falls could occur in Jurupa Valley in a major earthquake. Landslides and rock falls occur most often on steep, eroded or undercut, or disturbed hillsides.

Jurupa Valley has been inventoried for geologic formations known potentially to contain paleontological resources. Paleontological resources are the fossilized biotic remains of ancient environments. They are valued for the information they yield about the history of the earth and its past ecological settings. The proposed project area lands range from lands with low, undetermined, or high potential for finding paleontological resources (Figure 4-18, City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan, 2017). Riverside County has an extensive record of fossil life starting in the Jurassic period, 150 million years ago. State- or federally listed historic resources. Based on preliminary historic studies and field evidence, it is likely that other, unlisted historically significant properties exist in Jurupa Valley, to be identified through future historic surveys or individual site inventories.

Discussion

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

1. 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.

The restoration project sites are not mapped on the California Geological Survey's Earthquake Fault Zone regulatory maps, including Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning maps. However, as discussed in the affected environment section above, the proposed project is located in the vicinity of several active fault lines including the San Jacinto and Elsinore faults, but outside of the San Andreas fault. No structures are proposed as part of the project. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse impacts related to earthquakes. No impact would occur.

2. Strong seismic ground shaking?

The restoration areas have a potential for strong seismic ground shaking according to the State of California Seismic Safety Commission map "Earthquake Shaking Potential for the Los Angeles Metropolitan Region, Counties, Summer, 2003 (http://ssc.ca.gov/forms_pubs/la_county_print.pdf). This map shows the relative intensity of ground shaking and damage in the Los Angeles metropolitan region from anticipated future earthquakes. Restoration activities do not propose any permanent structures intended for human occupation that would create a potential risk from seismic ground shaking. No impact would occur.

3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

According to the City of Riverside General Plan EIR and City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan, the major geologic hazards associated with ground-shaking include liquefaction and ground failure. Liquefaction occurs when ground shaking causes water-saturated soils to become fluid and lose strength. Liquefaction historically has been responsible for significant damage during seismic events, creating problems with bridges, buildings, buried pipes, and underground storage tanks. The tributaries restoration sites are underlain by areas susceptible to varying degrees of liquefaction, ranging from moderate to very high. Liquefaction hazards are particularly significant along watercourses, including the area along the Santa Ana River. However, since the restoration activities do not propose any permanent structures intended for human occupation, no impact to humans due to liquefaction would occur.

4. Landslides?

According to the City of Riverside General Plan EIR and City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan, seismically-induced landslides and rockfalls would be expected in the Santa Ana River floodplain in the event of a major earthquake or human activity. Strong ground motions can also worsen existing unstable slope conditions, particularly if coupled with saturated ground conditions. Factors contributing to the stability of slopes include slope height and steepness, engineering characteristics of the earth materials composing the slope, and intensity of ground shaking. A ground acceleration of at least 0.10 g in steep terrain is necessary to induce earthquake-related rockfalls, although exceeding this value does not guarantee that rockfalls would occur. Because there are several faults

capable of generating peak ground accelerations of over 0.10 g in Riverside County, there is a high potential for seismically-induced rockfalls and landslides to occur. Construction crews and other onsite personnel could be exposed to landslide risk during project construction and maintenance. These impacts would be temporary and unlikely to be significant.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

There is potential for soil erosion or the loss of topsoil from restoration activities, but controls on erosion and runoff implemented during construction and the vegetation establishment periods would avoid or minimize adverse impacts. Restoration activities would include bank stabilization, which is designed to significantly reduce erosion relative to existing conditions. Restoration activities would also include removal of invasive and non-native plant species that could temporarily contribute to soil erosion or the loss of topsoil during and immediately following removal. Erosion and sediment control best management practices (BMPs) would be put in place to limit erosion and prevent sediment impacts to adjacent aquatic habitat through compliance with the Construction General Permit.

The proposed project would include restoring the interaction between the Santa Ana River tributaries and floodplains to increase native fish habitat and reduce channel incision. The existing conditions in the tributaries include confined channels with steep and tall banks that have little to no floodplain connectivity. The objective of floodplain creation is to provide additional areas where overbank flows can spread out into riparian zones and reduce the erosive force in the channel that contribute to channel downcutting and bank erosion. Significant adverse impacts on soils are not anticipated. Overall these channel modifications would improve soil erosion in the system. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

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 an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Two of the restoration sites are currently incised and unstable (Lower Hole Creek and Anza Creek). The restoration work would focus on stabilizing existing erosive banks and restoring natural stream function and would not adversely affect the potential for landsliding, spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. No impacts are expected.

d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

According to the Riverside General Plan EIR, the proposed project area contains the following general soil associations: Cajalco-Temescal-Las Posas, Traver-Domino-Willows, Cieneba-Rock Land-Fallbrook, Monserate-Arlington-Exeter and Hanford-Tujunga-Greenfield associations. Soil associations in the proposed project are generally well-drained sandy loams that are moderately deep. A test for expansive soils at the propose project sites has not been conducted based on literature review. However, the proposed project does not include any occupied structures, nor does the proposed project include construction of habitable structures within the project area. The proposed project would not create a substantial risk to life or property due to expansive soil and there would be no impact.

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

The project would not include any installation or use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The project would therefore have no impacts related to wastewater disposal.

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

Jurupa Valley has been inventoried for geologic formations known potentially to contain paleontological resources. The proposed project area lands range from lands with low, undetermined, or high potential for finding paleontological resources (Figure 4-18, City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan, 2017). The proposed project would create a potentially significant impact to paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature. The EIR will evaluate paleontological resource impacts.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Affected Environment

Greenhouse gases (GHG) are gases that absorb infrared radiation in the atmosphere. This absorption traps heat, maintaining the earth's surface temperature at level higher than would be the case in the absence of GHGs, leading to many disruptions to natural earth processes. GHGs include water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_20), perfluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, and halogenated chlorofluorocarbons. The primary GHGs associated with the project are CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O.

A variety of legislation has been enacted at the state level related to climate change and achieving statewide GHG emissions reductions from all sectors of the economy. Assembly Bill (AB) 32 (2006) codified the state's GHG emissions targets and requires CARB to implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. CARB adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) in December 2008, which outlines measures for meeting the 2020 GHG emissions reduction limits. Senate Bill (SB) 32 was signed in 2016 and expands on AB 32, requiring CARB to ensure statewide emissions are reduced to at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The most recent Scoping Plan update was released in 2016, and outlines policies and actions for the state's 2030 GHG emissions target, as outlined in SB 32.

The State CEQA Guidelines require lead agencies to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of GHG emissions that would result from a project. Section 15064.4 calls for a good-faith effort when describing, calculating, or estimating GHG emissions. Section 15064.4 also states that a determination of the significance of GHG impacts should consider whether the project would increase or reduce GHG emissions, exceed a locally applicable threshold of significance, or comply with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions. However, the revised guidelines do not require or recommend a specific analysis methodology or provide quantitative criteria for determining the significance of GHG emissions and the guidelines confirm that lead agencies have the discretion to determine appropriate significance thresholds. The revised guidelines also state that preparation of an EIR is required if "there is substantial evidence that the possible effects of a particular project are still cumulatively considerable notwithstanding compliance with adopted regulations or requirements" (Section 15064.4).

Discussion

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

The main source of GHG emissions associated with the proposed project would be related to combustion of fossil fuels during the restoration construction activities from use of heavy construction equipment, trucks to haul material and equipment, and construction-related passenger vehicle trips. The proposed project would not add any new natural lands. Rather, the proposed project would restore functionality to existing wetlands and riparian areas. Because the project proposes to enhance, rehabilitate, and re-establish hydrological processes, vegetation communities, and wildlife habitats, operation of the proposed project is expected to be aligned with local and statewide efforts to increase carbon sequestration, and is therefore not expected to generate GHG emissions.

Impacts related to GHG emissions, including short-term emissions during construction and long-term carbon sequestration, are expected to be less than significant. The EIR will analyze emissions related to the project construction and operations and discuss the potential for restoration opportunities to affect existing sequestration and plant decomposition emission rates (i.e., greenhouse gas flux).

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

As discussed above, AB 32 and SB 32 codified the state's GHG emissions reduction targets for 2020 and 2030, respectively. These documents identified the acceptable level of GHG emissions in California needed to reach these targets, and represent the most applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

GHG emissions from the proposed project would be related to short-term construction activities, and are not expected to exceed the relevant significance thresholds. The EIR will discuss the potential impact of restoration activities and benefit of wetland restoration in terms of applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for reducing GHG emissions. While it is not anticipated that the proposed project will conflict with the goals of the applicable statewide plans (i.e. the targets established by AB 32 and SB 32) or regional plans, any potential conflict or inconsistency would be assessed in detail in the GHG Emissions chapter of the EIR.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c. Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Be located on a site that 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f. Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

A hazardous material is any material that because of its quality, concentration or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant potential hazard to human health or safety or to the environment. Hazardous materials are used in urban areas for a variety of purposes. The most common large users include manufacturers, medical clinics, agriculture, dry cleaners, pest controllers, film processors, and automotive related business.

Large users and transporters of hazardous materials are monitored and regulated by the EPA and other Federal, State and County regulatory agencies, such as the State Department of Toxic Substance Control and the Riverside Fire Department.

The EPA has identified a total of 29 sites in the City of Riverside and within its sphere of influence on its 2007 Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) database. These are sites that are known to release toxic chemicals into the air. The EPA's TRI reporting program closely monitors the emissions from these facilities to ensure that their annual limits allowed under Federal regulations are not exceeded and that public health and safety are protected.

Given the City of Riverside's proximity to the Santa Ana River and the City's heavy reliance upon local groundwater basins for drinking water, improper use and disposal of hazardous materials poses a significant threat. Sources of possible contaminants include septic systems, composting activities, and business practices. At present, the water supplied by the Riverside Public Utilities Department (RPU) typically meets or exceeds State and Federal water regulations and guidelines. RPU staff monitors the quality of the water supply and complies with State and Federal regulatory activity requirements (City of Riverside General Plan 2025, 2007).

In Jurupa Valley, contaminated sites are a source of hazardous materials in Jurupa Valley. The Stringfellow Remediation Site near SR 60 and Pyrite Street, approximately 3.3 miles north of the restoration sites, is perhaps the most well-known contaminated site in the region. The former hazardous waste disposal site leached toxins into the environment and has been undergoing remediation through the federal Superfund process. In addition to contaminating the surface and soil, the site leaked toxins into Pyrite Creek and the groundwater basin, which traveled in a southwest-trending "plume" to the community of Glen Avon and other areas. The remediation effort includes monitoring and remediation of groundwater supplies.

Disaster preparedness is important to Jurupa Valley to establish the most effective and efficient ways to address hazards and minimize the effects of hazards on life and property, reduce the potential for disasters, and recover from the effects of disasters as quickly as possible. The City of Jurupa Valley has adopted a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) and participates in the County of Riverside Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. The plans set goals to mitigate potential risks from natural and man-made hazards, identify vulnerabilities, provide recommendations for actions, evaluate resources, and identify future mitigation planning and maintenance of existing plan. The City also has an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) that addresses how the City will respond to emergency situations ranging from minor incidents to large-scale disasters.

Discussion

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

No transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials is proposed as part of the restoration activities. Three sites (Anza Creek, Old Ranch Creek, and Lower Hole Creek) are bordered by former landfills, but no alterations to the landfills are proposed. The landfills are elevated above the Santa Ana River floodplain and their slopes are armored. There is a large capped landfill (Tequesquite Landfill) immediately upstream of the Anza Creek and Old Creek sites with an expansive solar grid. The proposed project, particularly in the vicinity of the Santa Ana River at the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek sites would be designed to avoid impacts to the landfill.

Construction of the proposed project would involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as fuel, solvents, chemicals, and oils associated with operating construction equipment. Such transport, use, and disposal must be compliant with applicable regulations such as the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), which regulates the generation, transport, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste; Department of Transportation Hazardous Materials Regulations, which cover all aspects of hazardous materials packaging, handling, and transportation; and the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) regulations. Although small amounts of fuel, solvents, chemicals, and oils would be transported, used, and disposed of during the construction phase, these materials are typically used in construction projects and would not represent the transport, use, and disposal of acutely hazardous materials.

Even though no transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials is associated with the project, there is potential for transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during construction. However, compliance with federal, state, and local regulations, in combination with construction BMPs implemented from a SWPPP as listed in Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality, would ensure that all hazardous materials are transported, used, stored, and disposed properly, which would minimize a significant hazard to the public during the construction phase of the project. As such, any impact would be less than significant.

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?

No significant hazard to the public or environment through release of hazardous materials is likely as a result of restoration work. The Anza Creek, Old Ranch Creek, and Lower Hole Creek tributary sites are bordered by former landfills, but no alterations to the landfills are proposed and the restoration work would not create reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions at either former landfill.

Construction-related hazardous materials would be used during construction of the proposed project, including fuel, solvents, chemicals, and oils, for the operation of construction equipment. It is possible that any of these substances could be released in small amounts during construction activities. However, compliance with federal, state, and local regulations, in combination with construction BMPs implemented from a SWPPP as listed in Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality, would ensure that all hazardous materials are transported, used, stored, and disposed properly, which would minimize potential impacts related to a hazardous materials release during the construction phase of the project.

According to the proposed project's Opportunities and Constraints Report, the landfill immediately upstream of the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek tributary sites (which first appears in the 1948 imagery) severely limits the natural course of the main stem Santa Ana River and its ability to meander back into the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek tributaries sites (ICF, 2018). The landfill constrains potential restoration opportunities at the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek sites because any modification to elevations that facilitate additional engagement with the Santa Ana River would have to account for the protection needed for the landfill. It is unlikely that restoration would result in restoration of fluvial disturbance processes that formerly characterized the site such as river channel migration or avulsion. Most of the floodplain in the site along the Santa Ana River is elevated at least eight feet above the Santa Ana River's low-flow channel.

The Santa Ana River flows westward along the northern edge of the site boundary at the downstream end of the creek. In 2010, a large flood in the Santa Ana River altered the channel morphology near the confluence with Lower Hole Creek and caused substantial erosion into Pedley Landfill. As a result of the risk for continued erosion into the landfill, a project was initiated to excavate approximately 1.3 acres of the landfill and install interlocking concrete mat on the river's south bank. The OHWM of the Santa Ana River now extends across the wide sandbar to the current bank of the landfill and into the downstream portion of Lower Hole Creek.

In addition, the historic Pedley Landfill along the eastern edge of the creek at the very downstream end further limits the channel migration and restoration opportunities. It is currently presumed that removal of the landfill is cost prohibitive; however, revegetation along the creek may be an option. Additional analysis will be provided in the EIR.

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

No hazardous emissions or handling hazardous materials is proposed at any of the restoration sites. There is potential for hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous materials, such as gas, oil, hydraulic fluid, degreaser, etc. from construction equipment. Terrace Elementary School is located within one-quarter mile of the Lower Hole Creek restoration site, but no other schools are located within one-quarter mile of any of the other restoration sites. Since the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or involve handling of hazardous materials or waste, but there is a potential for hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous materials from construction equipment, any impact would be considered less than significant.

d. Be located on a site that 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?

The proposed project is not located on a site included on the Government Code Section 65962.5 list of hazardous materials sites. No impact would occur.

e. Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

The Riverside Municipal Airport and Flabob Airport are within two miles of the restoration areas. Flabob Airport is located just northwest of the project site across the Santa Ana River, and features a 3,200-foot runway. The restoration areas are within the Flight Corridor Buffer and Airport Influence Area for these two airports according to the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposed project would involve restoration and enhancement of the native habitat within the boundaries of the restoration site and, thus, would not include elevated features that could interfere with navigable airspace. Site preparation, planting, and maintenance and monitoring activities would have no effect on air traffic patterns. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns or result in a safety hazard for people working in the project area. No residences are proposed as part of the project so the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area. During construction and maintenance of the proposed project, workers would be subject to safety hazards due to prolonged daily presence within the Flight Corridor Buffers and Airport Influence Areas. This impact would be temporary and would be considered less than significant.

f. Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Flabob Airport is located just northwest of the project site across the Santa Ana River, and features a 3,200-foot runway. The facility primarily supports private recreational and business air travel. It is located in the unincorporated Riverside County community of Rubidoux.

The proposed project would involve restoration and enhancement of the native habitat within the boundaries of the restoration site and, thus, would not include elevated features that could interfere with navigable airspace. Site preparation, planting, and maintenance and monitoring activities would have no effect on air strip activities or traffic patterns. No residences are proposed as part of the project so the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area. During construction and maintenance of the proposed project, workers would be subject to safety hazards due to prolonged daily presence within the Flight Corridor Buffers and Airport Influence Areas. This impact would be temporary and would be considered less than significant.

g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The restoration areas are mostly within natural areas and the restoration work would not alter any roadways that could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. None of the restoration would involve modifications to facilities that are critical to emergency response, such as police, fire, and hospital facilities, nor would the restoration impede access to these facilities in an emergency. No impact would result.

h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

The project site is heavily used by the homeless population in the area. Wildland fires are common in the Santa Ana River Watershed both from natural causes, arson, and unintended incidents. This poses a substantial risk to restoration performed on site, as human use at this level is difficult to control without support from the local community, fire protection, and law enforcement, but no additional risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires over existing conditions. The restoration work could potentially reduce the incidences of arson from displacement of the existing homeless population. Additionally, there would be no significant increase in naturally-caused fires due to maintaining similar natural open spaces as exists currently at the sites. Neighboring residences are expected to remain in the project vicinity, but there is no additional risk to these areas introduced by the project since the project area will maintain the area as natural open space. Because there would be no exposure to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, there would be no impact.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☒	☐
j. Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

The Santa Ana River drains a watershed of over 2,700 square miles which includes Orange County, the northwestern corner of Riverside County, southwestern corner of San Bernardino County and a small portion of Los Angeles County.

Hydrological processes have been altered by the historical and recent land uses in the area. The main stem Santa Ana River previously meandered through this site. The landfill immediately upstream of the site (which first appears in the 1948 imagery) severely limits the natural course of the main stem Santa Ana River and its ability to meander back into the site. The landfill would also constrain restoration opportunities because any modification to elevations that facilitate additional engagement with the Santa Ana River would have to account for the protection needed for the landfill.

It is unlikely that restoration work would result in restoration of fluvial disturbance processes that formerly characterized the site, such as Santa Ana River channel migration or avulsion. Most of the floodplain in the site along the Santa Ana River is elevated at least 8 feet above the Santa Ana River's low-flow channel. Based on floodplain mapping and analysis of U.S. Geological Survey Santa Ana River gage rating curves, it requires a flood of about 35,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) for water surface elevations to be high enough to inundate the site's floodplain. This magnitude flow has an annual probability of 4%, or a 25-year recurrence interval. Although they happen rather infrequently, periodic inundation by peak flows would continue to occur, which would help to replenish a source of fluvial sediment on the site and would help to restore some fluvial disturbance to promote scour and recruitment of native riparian vegetation.

Similarly, flow supplementation, although it may establish perennial flow, would not achieve volumes characteristic of peak flow events that formed fluvial landforms at the site, and so processes important to native fish such as periodic scour and transport of sediment would not be reestablished to the same level at which they previously occurred. Management, maintenance activities, and a scaling of new channel habitat features compatible with the available flow supply would instead be necessary to maintain suitable habitat for native fish.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) prepares Flood Insurance Rate Maps, or FIRM maps, to graphically show areas prone to flooding during 100-year and 500-year frequency floods. Figure 8-9 of the Draft General Plan identifies the flood prone portions of Jurupa Valley based on FIRM maps and flood district data. The proposed project is located within the 100-year floodplain. Throughout the years, flooding events on the Santa Ana River have resulted in the loss of livestock, infrastructure, property, and even lives. Despite major improvements in flood management methods and planning, portions of Jurupa Valley are still at risk of flooding during major events. It continues to be in the City's best interest to regulate and monitor development in floodplain and flood prone areas.

Discussion

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

There are no pollutant discharges associated with the project. During construction there would be removal of non-native plant species and grading work to establish or enhance channels in the restoration areas as well as provide a connection between the channel and floodplain. There would be protections in place to prevent sediment related to construction activities from migrating into

stream channels and the Santa Ana River as well as hazardous materials (gasoline, oils, etc.) from construction equipment that could be accidentally released.

The proposed project would disturb over 1 acre of land and is subject to the California State Water Resources Control Board's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Constructions and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit). This permit requires implementation of BMPs during construction and development of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to reduce or eliminate stormwater discharges during construction. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

Long-term the restoration work would enhance natural hydrologic function of the tributaries and establish native vegetation resulting in improved sediment transport and water quality.

b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

The restoration activities would include defining channels and drainage patterns to create habitat while enhancing connection to the floodplain to prevent channel downcutting and bank erosion. This could lead to modifying groundwater infiltration during dry-weather and wet-weather conditions. Channelizing poorly defined flow paths to create fish habitat even in dry-weather conditions could result in decreased localized groundwater infiltration. By creating streams and drainage patterns to provide adequate depths and velocities for fish habitat, water would be efficiently conveyed downstream and water could infiltrate into the ground. Overall groundwater infiltration would likely increase compared to existing conditions by the proposed restoration of floodplain connectivity with the channels and establishing new ones in certain areas. Storm flows would be able to spread across a wider area and infiltrate throughout the restoration area instead of being confined to a steep narrow channel and conveyed downstream as currently exists at the sites.

Establishing native plant species throughout the restoration area would potentially increase groundwater recharge as well. Typically plant species native to Southern California use water more efficiently than non-native species and could increase the availability of shallow groundwater in the restoration areas.

The overall impact of these changes in local drainage and groundwater recharge would be evaluated in the EIR.

c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?

The proposed project is located within the historic Santa Ana River floodplain and is low gradient with undulating surface topography as a result of historic flood flows as well as human activities including foot trails. Any restoration efforts and alteration of local hydrology would need to account for the minimal gradient change from upstream to downstream.

The proposed project would enhance resiliency to channel erosion and provide connectivity to floodplain areas. By reducing channel downcutting and bank erosion, the proposed project would reduce erosion and siltation both onsite and downstream. Existing channels within the restoration areas are deeper and more confined than the proposed restored channels, which would have

enhanced bank stabilization and floodplain connectivity in certain areas to address the existing channel downcutting and bank erosion issues.

Additionally, there would be recontouring, bank stabilization, and revegetation work in select highly erosive areas as well as at the confluence between the Santa Ana River and the tributaries within the restoration areas. This work proposes to restore areas with substantial existing erosion, debris, and sedimentation issues, with the intent of leading to less erosion or siltation onsite or offsite when compared to existing conditions. Any changes to localized drainage patterns of the tributaries or flows within the restoration areas would be evaluated in the EIR.

d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?

The proposed project would alter the existing drainage pattern in certain parts of the site through the alteration of stream courses, but not in a manner that would result in flooding. Habitat for native species would be created by restoring existing channels and establish new ones in certain areas. In both cases local flood conveyance would be improved by making the channel's hydraulic capacity more efficient when compared to its existing degraded state. No new flows would be introduced to the area. The restoration areas are all within the floodplain of the Santa Ana River. Any changes to localized drainage patterns of the tributaries or flows within the restoration areas would be evaluated in the EIR.

e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of stormwater systems or provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff. Alterations to drainage patterns would occur outside of the stormwater drainage system and not introduce new water sources that could overwhelm stormwater infrastructure. The Santa Ana River is the primary discharge point for all altered drainage patterns in the restoration areas and stormwater infrastructure is not relied upon to convey storm water from the restoration areas to the Santa Ana River. Most of the alterations occur in natural areas without any planned or existing stormwater infrastructure. No water sources that could contain polluted runoff are included in the project. No impact would occur.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

The proposed project would not introduce any sources that could degrade water quality within the Santa Ana River or its tributaries. The project would create conditions for more natural function of the tributaries within the restoration areas with interaction between floodplain and channel that do not currently exist. This would allow some treatment of water through settling of flood flows and groundwater recharge during rain events that does not currently exist, potentially improving downstream water quality.

Good water quality is a requirement for native fish habitat to be suitable, so it is the purpose of the project to improve water quality compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in degraded water quality compared to existing conditions. No impact would occur.

g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

The proposed project does not include any new housing development. Existing housing in the vicinity of the restoration areas is located well above the top of stream banks and significantly higher than the existing flood elevations that occur during rain events. No modifications are proposed in these areas besides armoring the bank in select areas and providing connection between the channel and floodplain that would serve to lower flood elevations by allowing spreading of storm flows over a wider floodplain when compared to existing conditions.

The project would not increase flows during the 100-year flood event and would not significantly alter or increase flood risk. The restoration areas are all within the 100-year flood hazard area of the Santa Ana River and any changes to localized drainage patterns of the tributaries within the restoration areas would be negligible during a 100-year storm event. No impact would occur.

h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?

No permanent structures are proposed as part of the project that would impede or redirect flood flows. Restoring floodplain connectivity would enhance natural flood-carrying functions of the tributaries in restoration areas that would serve to lower flood elevations. The restoration areas are within the 100-year flood hazard area of the Santa Ana River and the proposed bank stabilization and channel restoration work on Santa Ana River tributaries would have a negligible or positive effect on the Santa Ana River 100-year flood hazard area.

The EIR will analyze the project area for onsite and offsite FEMA-flood zone designations, inundation and overflow characteristics. The analysis will check post-restoration flow rates in the proposed project area to ensure that they do not exceed pre-restoration flow rates. The proposed project impact would be less than significant.

i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

The proposed project does not involve any flood control structures, such as levees or dams that would be relied upon to protect people or structures from significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. The project focuses on providing native fish habitat on tributaries of the Santa Ana River and this work would not present any additional flood risk to people or structures over existing conditions. The primary flood risk in the area is the Santa Ana River and the proposed project would have negligible impact on Santa Ana River flood risk. There are no proposed water-bearing structures as part of the project that could fail and release large volumes of water such as levees or dams.

The EIR will analyze the project sites for onsite and offsite FEMA-flood zone designations, inundation and overflow characteristics. The analysis will check post-restoration flow rates in the proposed project to ensure that they do not exceed pre-restoration flow rates. The proposed project impact would be less than significant.

j. Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

The Santa Ana River and tributaries are not currently subject to inundation by seiche or tsunami and the restoration activities would not contribute to inundation by seiche or tsunami. The restoration work would stabilize degraded river banks and improve resiliency to mudflows over existing conditions. No impact would occur.

X. Land Use and Planning	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Affected Environment

Anza Creek, Old Ranch Creek, and Lower Hole Creek are located entirely within the City of Riverside, while Hidden Valley Creek is in the Cities of Riverside and Jurupa Valley. The combined Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek sites are within a restoration area totaling 321 acres, while Hidden Valley Creek is 112 acres and Hole Creek is 75 acres. As detailed in the project description, the proposed project is within the Santa Ana River Floodplain within the Cities of Riverside and Jurupa Valley. The City of Jurupa Valley includes the proposed project within the Santa Ana River Overlay Zone. The area surrounding the restoration tributaries sites are influenced by urban uses and development. The Santa Ana River Trail traverses the project area and provides access to the area as well as human influences and activities. There is a large capped landfill (Tequesquite Landfill) upstream of the site with an expansive solar grid.

The City of Riverside's General Plan describes the Santa Ana River as follows.

"The Santa Ana River, the arroyos and other open space resources serve as wildlife corridors for the movement of species throughout the region... creative solutions would continue to be implemented to preserve sensitive habitat areas and agricultural resources" (The City of Riverside General Plan 2025, 2007).

The zoning designations for the proposed project are as follows:

- The Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek sites are zoned as PF by the City of Riverside.
- The Lower Hole Creek restoration site has the following City of Riverside zoning designations: PF, BMP, and RE.
- The Hidden Valley Creek restoration site has the following City of Riverside zoning designation: PF. The site has the following City of Jurupa Valley zoning designation: W-1 (Watercourse, Watershed, and Conservation Areas).

Discussion

a. Physically divide an established community?

The proposed project would not physically divide an established community because the proposed improvements involve creation, re-establishment, and/or enhancement of degraded aquatic, riparian, or upland habitat within historical channels. The Santa Ana River influences the site by creating a natural barrier between land uses north and south of the Santa Ana River with all tributaries restoration sites located south of the River. While some areas of the proposed project are adjacent to or nearby established residential communities, no new urban development is proposed as part of the project. The sites would remain as undeveloped natural open spaces with only minimal other development that would support the restoration function of the project sites. No impact would occur.

b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

As detailed in the project description, the proposed project is consistent with the City of Riverside General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Creation, enhancement, and restoration of native habitat areas within the Santa Ana River floodplain is considered to be consistent with each City of Riverside's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. No changes to existing designations or zoning are proposed.

The proposed project site, Hidden Valley Creek, is located within the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Open Space-Water, Open Space Conservation Habitat, and Open Space Recreation designations as well as the Santa Ana River Overlay Zone which primarily includes the Santa Ana River and its floodplain. The proposed project's restoration activities are consistent with maintenance of long-term habitat and riparian values. No changes to or conflicts with existing City of Jurupa Valley General Plan or Zoning designations would occur.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

As detailed in the project description, the proposed project is aligned with the goals and objectives of the Upper SAR HCP. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

XI. Mineral Resources	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

As detailed in the project description, the proposed project is located in the Cities of Riverside and Jurupa Valley. The proposed project would be subject to the City of Riverside and City of Jurupa General Plans. Of the four locations included in the proposed project, the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek tributaries restoration sites are within a state-classified mineral resource zone (MRZ-3) identified in the City of Riverside General Plan EIR (2007). Anza Creek, Old Ranch Creek, and Hidden Valley Creek are within a MRZ-3 zone in the City of Jurupa Draft General Plan (2017). The Anza Creek site is also designated within a MRZ-3 zone in the County of Riverside General Plan (2015). This designation indicates that the area contains known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance. Valuable mineral resources in the region include granitic rock (gr) and deposits of other rock products including feldspar, silica, and limestone. While the quarrying of gr was a significant industry in Riverside historically, these operations have not been active for decades.

Discussion

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?

Although the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek tributaries restoration sites are within a state-classified mineral resource zone (MRZ-3), the construction phase of the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region because the project would not result in the removal or mining of the known mineral resource. No operational impacts would result as any maintenance to occur as a part of the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No mining of natural resources would occur. No impact would occur.

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?

Although the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek restoration sites are within a state-classified mineral resource zone (MRZ-3), it is assumed that the construction phase of the project would not result in

the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site as identified in the City of Riverside General Plan EIR (2007). Therefore, no impact would occur.

XII. Noise	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b. Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c. Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e. Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f. Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

As detailed in the project description, the proposed project is located in the Cities of Riverside and Jurupa Valley. The proposed project would be subject to local standards and guidelines including the City of Riverside General Plan, the City of Riverside Municipal Code (Title 7, *Noise Control)*, the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan, and the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code (Chapter 11.05, *Noise Regulations)*. The project vicinity is subject to typical urban and suburban noises, such as noise generated by traffic, rail, aircraft, heavy machinery, and day-to-day outdoor activities. *Ambient noise* at a given location or area is the cumulative effect of noise from transportation activities and stationary sources. *Transportation noise* refers to noise from automobile use, trucking, airport operations, and rail operations. *Non-transportation noise* typically refers to noise from stationary sources such as commercial establishments, machinery, air conditioning systems, compressors, and landscape maintenance equipment. Regardless of the type of noise, the noise levels are highest near the source and decrease with distance. Noise is most often defined as unwanted sound. Although sound can be easily measured, the perceptibility is subjective and the physiological response to sound complicates the analysis of its impact on people. People judge the relative magnitude of sound sensation in subjective terms such as “noisiness” or “loudness.” Sound pressure magnitude is measured and quantified using a logarithmic ratio of pressures, the scale of which gives the level of

sound in decibels (dB). The human hearing system is not equally sensitive to sound at all frequencies. Therefore, to approximate this human, frequency-dependent response, the A-weighting filter system is used to adjust measured sound levels and is expressed as dBA (City of Riverside General Plan 2025, 2007).

The proposed project is located in the Santa Ana River floodplain which is designated as open space in the cities' General Plans. As detailed in the project description, the proposed project is located adjacent to or nearby neighboring residences. Residential areas are considered to be sensitive receptors.

Discussion

a. Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?

The proposed project would create short-term construction noise impacts to neighboring residences. Long-term maintenance activities and associated noise impacts would be intermittent in nature, occurring periodically in restoration areas. The EIR will assess the noise and vibration impacts associated with the project. Special consideration will be given to existing nearby noise-sensitive receptors, which include adjacent residential neighborhoods and native habitats which may contain endangered species. Construction activities could include grading and general earth moving on and around the project sites, as well as transport of construction materials and off-site hauling of excavated soil.

Construction noise and vibration will be evaluated based on construction equipment data to be provided by the project applicant, and noise and vibration modeling methodologies provided by agencies such as the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

Based on review of the two city's general plans, noise ordinances, and other applicable standards, if significant noise and/or vibration impacts are identified, mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level, where feasible, would be required.

b. Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

As discussed above in Section XIIa, the EIR will assess the noise and vibration impacts associated with the proposed the project. If potentially significant vibration impacts are identified, mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level would be required, where feasible.

c. Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Construction noise from the proposed project would be temporary and thus not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Therefore, permanent noise impacts would be less than significant. After completion of the restoration process, the proposed project is not anticipated to generate any operational noise or increase traffic in the area.

d. Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

The proposed project would generate a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity during the restoration process. As discussed in Noise Section X11a, above, the EIR for the proposed project would evaluate potential temporary construction noise using noise modeling methodologies provided by agencies such as the FTA, the FHWA, and the Caltrans. If significant noise and/or vibration impacts are identified, mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level, where feasible, would be required. The noise and vibration analysis will be summarized in the noise section of the EIR.

e. Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

The closest public airport to the proposed project sites is Riverside Municipal Airport, which accommodates general aviation aircraft. Riverside Municipal Airport is located approximately 0.4 mile east of the Lower Hole Creek site, 1.5 miles southeast of the Hidden Valley Creek site, and one-mile southwest of the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek tributaries sites. The project sites all lie outside of the 65 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour as illustrated in the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (2004) exhibit RI-3.

Flabob Airport, a public use airport, is located just northwest of the project site across the Santa Ana River, and features a 3,200-foot runway. The facility primarily supports private recreational and business air travel. It is located in the unincorporated Riverside County community of Rubidoux. Flabob Airport is located approximately one mile north of the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek tributaries sites, 3.4 miles northeast of the Lower Hole Creek site, and 3.8 miles northeast of the Hidden Valley Creek site. The project sites all lie outside of the 65 dB CNEL contour as illustrated in the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (2004) exhibit FL-3.

Due to the proximity of the nearby airports, there is a potential for people working on the project (during construction and maintenance) to be exposed to elevated noise levels from aircraft operations; however, the exposure will be temporary and short term. The project would not cause any alteration to existing airport noise levels and would not construct any new homes or other noise-sensitive structures. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

f. Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

There are no private airstrips in the project vicinity. Therefore, there would be no impact.

XIII. Population and Housing	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c. Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Affected Environment

The proposed project is located within the floodplain of the Santa Ana River and is designated as Parks and Open Space area per the City of Riverside General Plan 2025 (2007). The area surrounding the project is medium density residential housing with some industrial and business uses to the south of the proposed project site. There are currently no existing housing structures within the project site. However, there have been homeless encampments established within the floodplain.

A portion of the proposed project, the Hidden Valley Creek restoration site, is located within the City of Jurupa Valley. According to the City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan (2017), the Housing Element describes homeless individuals within the Santa Ana River Basin which includes portions of the proposed project area. In the 2015 Point-In-Time Count conducted by Riverside County, 168 unsheltered, homeless individuals were documented in the City of Jurupa Valley. After the City of Riverside, this is the second highest number of homeless persons among incorporated and unincorporated areas in Riverside County. Most of the homeless persons are residing in and near the Santa Ana River Basin, which runs along the City's east and south boundaries. As described in General Plan, *Appendix 13.0*, the causes of homelessness are varied and complex, and not readily resolved. In addition to complying with SB 2 regarding suitable zoning for a homeless shelter (the City has already set aside a zone that allows homeless shelters without discretionary review), the Housing Element includes a program calling for the City to actively work with neighboring jurisdictions to achieve regional cooperation to reduce homelessness.

Discussion

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

The proposed project would not construct any homes or businesses, extend roads, or involve the addition of any other infrastructure that would facilitate population growth. Therefore, impacts would not be considered to be growth-inducing and as such, no impacts would occur. This impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.

b. Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The proposed project would not displace a substantial number of existing housing units. However, the area is heavily populated with temporary homeless encampments, also known as transient camps. These encampments have resulted in trash and human waste placed in the area of the restoration sites and damage to the existing vegetation on site. The complex issue of homeless encampments in open space riparian areas would require the involvement and coordination of multiple agencies, including the implementation of the "Homeless Taskforce Plan" (Tool H-22, City of Riverside General Plan EIR, 2007). Homeless encampment removal is considered a potential impact and the EIR will address the issue of homeless encampments.

c. Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

As discussed above in Section XIIIb., the proposed project would result in the displacement of homeless encampments in order to conduct restoration activities, which is considered a potentially significant impact. This impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.

XIV. Public Services	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a 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 following public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

The proposed project is located within the Santa Ana River Floodplain. There have been multiple homeless encampments observed within the project boundaries.

Terrace Elementary School, Norte Vista High School, and Rosemary Kennedy Elementary School are within 1 to 1.5 miles to the south of the Hidden Valley project location. Peralta Elementary School is to the north of the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek project locations.

Martha McLean-Anza Narrows Park border the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek project locations to the east.

The Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek project locations lie within the City of Riverside Fire Department fire responder Area 1. The Hidden Valley Creek location lies within fire responder areas 7 and 109 (City of Riverside Fire Department Standard of Cover, 2017).

Riverside Police Department facilities have largely been centralized, with the headquarters building located at 4102 Orange Street in Downtown Riverside serving as the Department's administrative center and housing the office of the Chief of Police, the administrative division (personnel and training), the records branch, the Communications Bureau and the Community Services Bureau (City of Riverside General Plan EIR, 2007).

The City of Jurupa Valley is a contract city with the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. The personnel assigned to Jurupa Valley operate out of the Jurupa Valley Station which is located at 7477 Mission Boulevard in Jurupa Valley.

According to the City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan, as of January 2015, there were estimated to be 170 homeless individuals living within the City limits with 20 homeless encampments identified. A number of the encampments are located within the Santa Ana River as well as on public and private property along SR 60 and in other areas of the City. Homelessness is associated with a number of negative issues, including crime, blight, trash, unsanitary conditions, and illegal fires. In 2014, the Sheriff's Department created a Homeless Outreach Team to identify homeless individuals, reduce the homeless population, and coordinate the delivery of resources to the homeless. The Sheriff's Department coordinates homeless outreach with a number of additional agencies including, but not limited to, the City of Jurupa Valley, the Riverside County Department of Social Services, the Probation Department, the Department of Veteran's Affairs, and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

Discussion

a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a 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 following public services:

Fire protection?

The proposed project would restore native and habitat and remove trash and invasive species. The removal of homeless encampments from the project site would lower the risk of a fire spreading from a homeless encampment, as with the Skirball Fire in Los Angeles (2017), and thus would reduce the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities in the vicinity of the project site. No buildings or habitable structures that may require fire protection services are proposed. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an increased need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. No impact is expected.

Police protection?

As discussed above, the proposed project would require the removal of homeless encampments, resulting in the displacement of homeless people to available public facilities or other suitable areas. The removal of the encampments prior to construction activities may require police protection. However, any need for police protection to remove the homeless encampments would not require new or physically altered governmental facility construction to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives because the need would be short-term in nature. In the long-term, the proposed project could lower the number of homeless encampments and thus could reduce the need for police protection at or near the project site. Therefore, this project would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with police protection facilities.

Schools?

The proposed project would not result in adverse impacts on schools. Impacts on schools are usually associated with population growth due to the development of new housing units which can result in greater demands for school facilities. This project would have no effect on population growth and therefore, no impact on the need for new or physically altered school facilities.

Parks?

The proposed project would have less than significant impact on parks. Degradation of park facilities is usually associated with population growth, and the proposed project would have no effect on population growth as no new development is proposed. It is possible that use of onsite trails and the Santa Ana River bike path could increase slightly due to the enhanced habitat quality of the project area. However, this increase in usage is not expected to result in the increased demand for new or physically altered park facilities that would result in adverse physical impacts on the environment. Therefore, any impact would be less than significant.

Other public facilities?

The proposed project would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public facilities. The proposed project would result in improvements to habitat in the Santa Ana River floodplain. As discussed in the Population and Housing Section, the proposed project would require the removal of homeless encampments in order to restore the natural areas of the tributaries restoration sites. This issue will be addressed in the Population and Housing section of the EIR.

XV. Recreation	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Affected Environment

The Anza Creek, Old Ranch Creek, and Hidden Valley Creek tributaries restoration sites are used for recreation, including river swimming/wading in the Santa Ana River, horseback riding, and other trail-related uses. Historically, the nearby Hidden Valley ponds area provided a variety of recreational opportunities, including hiking, hunting, fishing, bird watching, and public education; however, after the ponds dried out they no longer support many of these recreational opportunities. The Lower Hole Creek site currently supports a short trail along the eastern side; however, the site is not utilized by the general public, as safety issues associated with the homeless encampments are a high concern. All four sites are bordered by the Santa Ana River bike path.

Discussion

a. 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?

The Hidden Valley Creek site is managed as part of the 1,500-acre Hidden Valley Nature Center wildlife area along the Santa Ana River and currently supports a trail along the southern side. Habitat enhancement and public education included in the proposed project have the potential for increasing the use of the existing Hidden Valley Nature Center. The Santa Ana River Trail traverses the project area. On-site and adjacent recreational uses would need to be considered for long-term management strategies of the sites. Therefore, the proposed project through potential increased use of the Hidden Valley Nature Center, Santa Ana River Trail, and other natural areas with public access could result in a potentially significant impact. The EIR will address potential impacts to recreational resources.

b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The proposed project does not include construction or expansion of recreational facilities. As such, the proposed project is not expected to have an adverse physical effect on the environment resulting from such activities. The proposed project includes public education opportunities. Community education opportunities at Lower Hole Creek could include trails, signage, outdoor activities, and

seating. Public education is also anticipated for the Hidden Valley Creek including educational signage as well as outdoor activities and seating. The EIR will address potential impacts to recreational resources from these public education opportunities.

XVI. Transportation/Traffic	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Affected Environment

As shown in Figure 1 in the proposed project description, all four sites are located in the northwestern portion of Riverside County and adjacent to the Santa Ana River. Figure 2 in the proposed project description provides a more detailed view of the proposed project location. The restoration sites of Hidden Valley Creek and Lower Hole Creek are located west of the intersection of the Santa Ana River and Van Buren Boulevard (four-lane 100-foot arterial), while the Anza Creek and Old Ranch Creek tributaries sites are located north of Jurupa Avenue (four-lane 88-foot transitioning to 110-foot arterial) and Grand Avenue (two-lane 66-foot collector) and west of Rubidoux Avenue. All four sites are bordered by the Santa Ana River bike path. Refer to the proposed project description for more detail.

Discussion

a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

The proposed project would not involve alterations to the existing traffic or circulation system in the project area or nearby communities. Construction activities may temporarily interfere with the Santa Ana River bike path that transects the proposed project restoration sites. All construction vehicles interfering with traffic along the bike path would be guided by personnel using signs and flags to direct traffic. Due to the temporary nature of the construction phase of the project, long term impacts to the flow of bicycle and pedestrian traffic that utilize the bike path would be considered less than significant.

The construction phase of the project is not expected to result in a noticeable increase in traffic volumes. Construction traffic would likely access the site via Jurupa Avenue. Any potential increases to the traffic volume in the surrounding areas would be limited to trips taken by construction vehicles to remove trash, invasive plant material, and construction debris from the project location to the El Sorbante Landfill, approximately 23 miles south of the proposed project site. In the long-term, after the completion of the restoration activities process, the proposed project is not anticipated to generate any additional vehicular traffic except for routine maintenance, which would be intermittent and as needed, similar to current conditions. Therefore, no long-term traffic analysis is required. No impact related to operational traffic would result with implementation of the proposed project. As such, overall impact of the project to traffic of the surrounding area would be expected to be less than significant.

b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Van Buren Boulevard is one of the main crossings of the Santa Ana River in the vicinity of the restoration areas. It is shown at Level of Service F in the Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Short-term traffic associated with project construction is not anticipated to significantly impact the traffic levels of the surrounding areas as construction vehicles would be mainly contained on site. Most staging and parking would be along the Santa Ana River trail, which is closed to traffic except for maintenance vehicles, and, therefore would not contribute to congestion. No safety concerns relative to construction activities would be expected due to typical construction signage, flagging, and health and safety construction plans and procedures associated with construction contracts and permit conditions. Active construction activities would avoid Santa Ana River trail path activities. Therefore, short-term impacts would be less than significant. After the completion of the restoration activities, the proposed project is not anticipated to generate any additional vehicular traffic. Therefore, no long-term traffic analysis is required. No impact related to operational traffic would result with implementation of the proposed project.

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?

The proposed project areas of Lower Hole Creek and Hidden Valley Creek lie approximately one-mile north of the Riverside Municipal Airport. The Old Farm Creek and Anza Creek project locations are approximately 1.5 miles northwest of the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Flabob Airport is located just northwest of the project site across the Santa Ana River, and features a 3,200-foot runway. The facility primarily supports private recreational and business air travel. It is located in the unincorporated Riverside County community of Rubidoux.

The proposed project would involve restoration and enhancement of the native habitat within the boundaries of the restoration site and, thus, would not include elevated features that could interfere with navigable airspace. Site preparation, planting, and maintenance and monitoring activities would have no effect on air traffic patterns. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No impact would occur.

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

The proposed project would not result in increased hazards or incompatible uses. No change to the local circulation network, including a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment), is proposed. Therefore, no impact would occur.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

The proposed project would not impair emergency access to the project location. As discussed above, traffic in the surrounding areas is anticipated to be minimal and limited to on-site construction-related equipment entering and leaving the project area. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not result in inadequate access for any emergency response entities. Because no habitable structures or buildings are proposed, and the proposed project would only improve the existing onsite natural habitat, emergency access would be adequate similar to existing conditions. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

As addressed in Section XVIa, construction activities may impact the use of the Santa Ana River Bicycle Path that transects the project sites. As stated previously, short-term traffic associated with project construction is not anticipated to significantly impact the traffic levels of the surrounding areas as construction vehicles would be mainly contained on site. Most staging and parking would be along the Santa Ana River trail, which is closed to traffic except for maintenance vehicles, and, therefore would not contribute to congestion. No safety concerns relative to construction activities would be expected due to typical construction signage, flagging, and health and safety construction plans and procedures associated with construction contracts and permit conditions. Active construction activities would avoid Santa Ana River trail path activities. This impact is expected to be short-term in duration and would not have any long-term impacts on the use of the bike path by pedestrians or cyclists. Any construction or maintenance activity that would impede the usage of this bike path would be addressed by adequate signage and construction flagging. Therefore, the impact would be less-than-significant.

XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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	☒	☐	☐	☐
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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☒	☐	☐	☐

Affected Environment

Refer to the Cultural Resources section for a discussion of the Tribal Cultural Resources affected environment.

Discussion

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

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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

a. and b. As described in the Cultural Resources discussion section, the proposed project is located in the Santa Ana River floodplain. Both the City of Riverside and City of Jurupa Valley General Plans have documented significant tribal and cultural resources within the project vicinity. The proposed project would involve restoration activities within an area ranked with high sensitivity in relation to archaeological resources. In addition, the General Plan EIR has documented historic and tribal cultural resources in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project may result in potentially significant impacts to tribal cultural resources requiring further evaluation.

The EIR will provide the results of a records search at the SCCIC for a half-mile radius surrounding the proposed restoration areas. The record search will provide background information on any previously conducted studies and previously recorded cultural resources in the area. Cultural resources surveys will be conducted to identify if there are cultural resources within proposed restoration area and the EIR will discuss the results of the tribal consultation currently ongoing.

The EIR will provide outreach to Native Americans, including the NAHC and local Native American representatives, to invite any comment on the project as it relates to cultural resources. A cultural resources analysis will be prepared for the project that will include project-specific analysis and data for inclusion into the EIR analysis.

XVIII. Utilities and Service Systems	Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

City of Riverside Utilities and Service Systems

The City of Riverside established its own water utility, the RPU, in 1913. RPU's primary water source comes from local groundwater basins from the Bunker Hill Basin in San Bernardino and Riverside North and South Basins in Riverside. RPU purchases water from Western Municipal Water District (WMWD), primarily to meet peak water demand during summer months and during emergencies. As of 2004, RPU provided water service to approximately 62,000 customers.

Stormwater flows directly into the City's storm drain system which then discharges into the Santa Ana River. The Santa Ana River drains a watershed of over 2,700 square miles which includes Orange County, the northwestern corner of Riverside County, southwestern corner of San Bernardino County and a small portion of Los Angeles County.

The City of Riverside Public Works Department provides for the collection, treatment and disposal of all wastewater generated within the City of Riverside, except for a small area located south of Van Buren Boulevard which is served by WMWD**,** through its Riverside Regional Water Quality Treatment Plant (RRWQCP) and complies with State and Federal requirements governing the treatment and discharge of wastewater. Primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment of wastewater from the Jurupa, Rubidoux, and Edgemont Community Services Districts is also provided.

The City of Riverside Public Works Department collects trash from approximately 38,500 households (70 percent of all households) largely using automated trash collection trucks. Excessive waste generation is discouraged by the Public Works Department by charging additional fees if a second trash container is required. All non-hazardous solid waste collected is taken to the Robert A. Nelson Transfer Station, which is owned by the County of Riverside and operated under a 20-year franchise by a private company. Waste is then transferred to the Badlands Landfill for disposal. However, local trash haulers may dispose of collected waste at other County landfills in the area, such as the Lamb Canyon Landfill and El Sobrante Landfill. All Riverside County landfills are Class III disposal sites permitted to receive non-hazardous municipal solid waste.

City of Jurupa Valley Utilities and Service Systems

According to the City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan, Jurupa Valley does not rely on imported water to provide its domestic needs and relies on local ground-water from the Chino and Riverside Groundwater Basins. Three agencies provide water to the City of Jurupa Valley, including the Jurupa Community Services District, the Rubidoux Community Services District, and the Santa Ana River Water Company. Jurupa Valley's local community services districts, have implemented emergency water conservation regulations to eliminate or reduce water-wasting practices and to conserve water resources on an ongoing basis.

The Jurupa Community Services District and the Rubidoux Community Services District provide wastewater service to most of Jurupa Valley. Wastewater is transported to two nearby municipal wastewater treatment plants. The Riverside Water Quality Control Plant is located in, and operated by, the City of Riverside. The Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority (WRCRWA) operates the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, which is located in the City of Corona. The two treatment plants treat the majority of wastewater to tertiary levels, which are discharged into the Santa Ana River. In addition, some of the wastewater is treated to recycled, or reclaimed, levels for irrigation purposes.

The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District serves as the regional flood management agency for western Riverside County. The District operates a series of storm drains and channels throughout Jurupa Valley that collect runoff water and ultimately direct it to the Santa Ana River.

Waste and recycling disposal in Jurupa Valley is provided by private companies. Trash from Jurupa Valley is transported to the Agua Mansa Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility at 1830 Agua Mansa Road. From there, recyclable materials are transferred to third-party providers, and waste materials are transported to various landfills in Riverside County.

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

The proposed project would not generate any wastewater. During construction activities, a portable toilet may be provided for construction workers. The toilet would be hauled away and the waste disposed of at an approved facility, such as the Riverside Water Quality Control Plant Septic Hauler Station. As such, no project impacts would occur related to wastewater treatment requirements.

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

The proposed project would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Temporary irrigation would occur during the planting and establishment phase of the proposed project. However, no new permanent water or wastewater facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities, are proposed. However, the EIR will address the proposed project's potential water facilities impacts.

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

The proposed project would not divert any stormwater to the City's stormwater system. Implementation of the proposed project would involve restoration and enhancement of the hydrology of the river and channels and native habitat within the boundaries of the restoration site. There will be temporary stormwater controls and a SWPPP in place during construction, but permanent stormwater control facilities would not be required. The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. As such, no project impacts would occur related to stormwater drainage facilities.

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

The proposed project would not require new water entitlements. The project aims to use natural water sources and stream functions to provide the target habitat areas. Potable water may be required during construction and plant establishment periods for the proposed native plantings.

A temporary irrigation system may be required to enhance the survivorship of newly installed native plants and seed when plants have been grown in nursery conditions, when they are planted under initially dry or drought conditions, or when planting does not occur within an ideal seasonal planting time frame.

Any system installed would be designed for temporary use for at least 3 years and discontinued once plant establishment is meeting plan goals. Ideally, the irrigation system would be shut-off by the end of the third year of the 5-year maintenance and monitoring period. Irrigation system components would be removed from the restoration site entirely at the end of the maintenance and monitoring period after approval is granted by the resource agencies. Regardless of long-term irrigation solutions, prior to planting and seeding, the soil on site would be moist from watering by the contractor or rainfall. All attempts would be made to coordinate seeding with rain events.

The project's water demand would be discussed in the EIR as multiple options are being considered at this time. The proposed project is not expected to put a significant additional demand on the

available water supplies; however, the EIR will address the proposed project's water supply impacts.

e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?

The proposed project would not include demand for wastewater services because restoration activities would not include a need for wastewater services. The proposed project would not generate wastewater, and no impacts would occur.

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

The proposed project's solid waste disposal needs primarily pertain to existing waste and debris in the natural areas proposed for restoration. The Anza Creek and Lower Hole Creek restoration sites are heavily used by the homeless population in the area, with encampments characterized by excessive on-site trash accumulation. In particular, multiple cathode-ray television sets were observed smashed in the river channel. Electronics of this kind are a source of heavy metal contamination to the environment and represent a human and wildlife health risk. Other types of trash, including concrete construction debris, clothes, and plastic, are pervasive within the river channel but are concentrated in the upstream portion of the site as described in the Existing Site Description section of the Site Characteristics and Preliminary Design of Santa Ana River Tributary Restoration Projects.

The proposed project would not significantly affect a landfill by accommodating the proposed project's solid waste disposal needs. During site preparation and removal of invasive species, cuttings and organic waste would be generated and completely removed from the project site and disposed of at the closest acceptable landfill or composting facility. Existing trash and debris, such as that generated by human occupation and activity, at the restoration sites would be disposed of at approved solid waste disposal facilities. The existing trash and debris, while important enough to require extra attention and effort for removal during restoration activities, is not substantial enough to exceed landfill capacities once removed from the restoration areas. Except for routine maintenance associated with ensuring the health of the native vegetation, the proposed project would not generate waste once operational, except for maintenance to remove debris and non-native vegetation as needed. The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to solid waste.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The proposed project would comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations related to the disposal of solid waste. There are no exceptional waste requirements that would require an exception to any statutes and regulations related to solid waste during construction or once fully operational. No impacts are expected for the proposed project.

XIX. Mandatory Findings of Significance		Potentially Significant Impact to be Evaluated in the EIR	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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.)	☒	☐	☐	☐
c.	Does the project have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Affected Environment

The Affected Environment has been described in prior environmental issue sections of the Initial Study document. Please refer to prior sections for more detail.

Discussion

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

As described in the project description and Initial Study affected environment and discussion sections, the proposed project would involve restoration activities aligned with related regulatory plans and policies. The proposed project would be beneficial for listed species and other wildlife and associated habitat through habitat restoration and enhancement. The proposed project would create potential short-term impacts to wildlife species and habitat due to short-term construction activities associated with restoration, which may be potentially significant if not sufficiently mitigated. As described earlier in the Cultural Resources section, the proposed project could have potentially significant impacts on important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.

However, the EIR will address any potentially significant impacts due to short-term construction-relation activities associated with restoration.

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.)

The proposed project could result in cumulative impacts related to the resources identified in this Initial Study with potentially significant impacts. There could also be cumulative impacts related to resources where the Initial Study indicated a less-than-significant impact, but, when added to other past, current, and probable future projects, would result in a cumulatively considerable impact. The EIR will address cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project in accordance with CEQA requirements.

c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

As described earlier, the proposed project would create beneficial effects for human beings and the environment by restoring native habitat in the project area. The exception to this is the need to relocate homeless encampment currently established at the proposed project sites in order to conduct the restoration activities; the EIR will address homeless encampment issues located within the project area.

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 2
References Cited

I. Aesthetics

Architectural Preservation Planning Services (APPS), Historic Preservation Element of the City of Riverside General Plan, report prepared by Architectural Preservation Planning Services, Pasadena, CA, report submitted to the City of Riverside Planning Department, Riverside, CA, 2003

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Scenic Highway Program, California Scenic Highway Mapping System, Riverside County, updated December 28, 1999. (Available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/Land Arch/scenic_highways/index.htm) accessed May 14, 2018.

City of Riverside, City of Riverside Park and Recreation Master Plan Update 2003.

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025 EIR.

City of Riverside, Urban Forest Policy, December 17, 2002.

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

Southern California Association of Governments, Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG), March 1996.

II. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025. Accessed May 15, 2018. https://riversideca.gov/planning/gp2025program/GP/04_Land_Use_and_Urban_Design_Element_with%20maps.pdf

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

III. Air Quality

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025 EIR.

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

IV. Biological Resources

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025 EIR.

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

ICF. 2018. Opportunities and Constraints at Four Tributary Restoration Sites. Early Implementation Activities: Upper Santa Ana River Habitat Conservation Plan. May. (ICF 00331.16.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Bernardino, CA.

ICF International. 2014. Phase 1 Report: Upper Santa Ana River Habitat Conservation Plan. March. (ICF 00455.13) Redlands, CA. Prepared for San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Bernardino, CA.

V. Cultural Resources

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025 EIR. County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

ICF. 2018. Opportunities and Constraints at Four Tributary Restoration Sites. Early Implementation Activities: Upper Santa Ana River Habitat Conservation Plan. May. (ICF 00331.16.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Bernardino, CA.

VI. Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025 EIR. County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

ICF. 2018. Opportunities and Constraints at Four Tributary Restoration Sites. Early Implementation Activities: Upper Santa Ana River Habitat Conservation Plan. May. (ICF 00331.16.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Bernardino, CA.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2008. Preliminary draft staff proposal. Recommended approaches for setting interim significance thresholds for greenhouse gases under the California Environmental Quality Act. 24 October 2008.

SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District). 2008. Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans. Agenda No. 31. December 5, 2008.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025. Accessed May 15, 2018. https://riversideca.gov/planning/gp2025program/GP/18_Public_Safety_Element_with%20maps.pdf

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

ICF. 2018. Opportunities and Constraints at Four Tributary Restoration Sites. Early Implementation Activities: Upper Santa Ana River Habitat Conservation Plan. May. (ICF 00331.16.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Bernardino, CA.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List)

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025 EIR.

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

ICF. 2018. Opportunities and Constraints at Four Tributary Restoration Sites. Early Implementation Activities: Upper Santa Ana River Habitat Conservation Plan. May. (ICF 00331.16.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Bernardino, CA.

X. Land Use and Planning

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Ordinance. Accessed May 22, 2018 https://library.municode.com/ca/jurupa_valley/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT9PLZO_CH9.30JUVAGEPLSPPL

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025 EIR.

City of Riverside Urban Forestry Policy Manual. August 2015. Accessed May 15, 2016. Policy Manual Accessed May 15, 2016. https://riversideca.gov/publicworks/trees/pdf/UrbanForestry-TOC.pdf

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

XI. Mineral Resources

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025 EIR.

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

XII. Noise

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025 EIR.

City of Riverside Municipal Code Noise Ordinance, Chapter 7.35. Accessed May 16, 2016 https://riversideca.gov/municode/pdf/07/7-35.pdf

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Volume 2 Chapter W6. Accesses May 16, 2018. http://www.rcaluc.org/Portals/0/PDFGeneral/plan/newplan/41-%20Vol.%202%20Riverside%20Municipal.pdf

XIII. Population and Housing

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside General Plan 2025, 2007 EIR. Accessed May 15, 2018.

City of Riverside Fire Department Standard of Cover, 2017. Accessed May 16, 2018.

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

XV. Recreation

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025 EIR.

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

XVI. Transportation/Traffic

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025.

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025.

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

ICF. 2018. Opportunities and Constraints at Four Tributary Restoration Sites. Early Implementation Activities: Upper Santa Ana River Habitat Conservation Plan. May. (ICF 00331.16.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Bernardino, CA.

XVIII. Utilities and Service Systems

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025.

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx

ICF. 2018. Opportunities and Constraints at Four Tributary Restoration Sites. Early Implementation Activities: Upper Santa Ana River Habitat Conservation Plan. May. (ICF 00331.16.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Bernardino, CA.

ICF International. 2015. Site Characteristics and Preliminary Design of Santa Ana River Tributary Restoration Projects. November. (ICF 00054.14) San Diego, CA. Prepared for San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Bernardino, CA.

XIX. Mandatory Findings of Significance

City of Jurupa Valley, 2017. City of Jurupa Valley Draft General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning/General-Plan

City of Riverside, 2007. City of Riverside General Plan 2025.

County of Riverside, 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. Accessed May 22, 2018 http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx