

**INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION:
PROPOSED 2009 AMENDMENT TO THE
1992 HEMET-RYAN AIRPORT
COMPREHENSIVE AIRPORT LAND USE PLAN**

Prepared for:

Riverside County

Airport Land Use Commission

Riverside County Administrative Center

4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor

Riverside, CA 92501

Prepared by:

Commission Staff

Riverside County Administrative Center

4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor

Riverside, CA 92501

March 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
[Proposed] Negative Declaration	1
Environmental Checklist.....	3
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	13
Environmental Determination	14
Initial Study	15
Environmental Issues Assessment	15
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts	15
Aesthetics	17
Agricultural Resources.....	19
Air Quality	21
Biological Resources	24
Cultural Resources	26
Geology and Soils	28
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	32
Hydrology and Water Quality	35
Land Use and Planning	38
Mineral Resources	41
Noise	43
Population and Housing.....	46
Public Services.....	48
Recreation	50
Transportation/Traffic	52
Utilities and Service Systems.....	54
Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	57
Sources	60

[PROPOSED] NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project Name: 2009 Amendment To The 1992 Hemet-Ryan Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan ("HRACALUP").

Lead Agency/Project Proponent: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission ("Commission").

Brief Project Description: The project is the Commission's proposed amendment of the HRACALUP, previously adopted on March 18, 1992. The amendment would revise the definition of "Places of Assembly" in Section II.E. (see pages 13 through 14 of the 1992 HRACALUP); the revised definition would be based on the occupancy level per square foot (pursuant to the California Building Code) and total square footage, rather than on an occupancy capacity of 50 persons.

As amended, the definition of "Places of Assembly" would read as follows, with additional text shown in *italics* and deletions in ~~strike~~through:

Any structure, public or private, or premise, or portion thereof ~~with a capacity for occupancy of over 50 persons~~ *exceeding 1,500 square feet in area, where the Building Code would provide for occupancy levels of an intensity exceeding one person per 30 square feet,* which is designed or used for entertainment, amusement, instruction, education, worship, deliberation, display, meeting, awaiting transportation or for the consumption of food and drink.

The list of examples of "Places of Assembly" in the HRACALUP would be amended to exclude recreational and entertainment facilities, shopping malls, major retail outlets, funeral homes, motels, banks, professional office buildings, and labor intensive industrial operations. The list would continue to include auditoriums, theaters, restaurants, churches, clubhouses, arenas, stadiums, circuses and bowling alleys.

The proposed amendment is regulatory in nature, and no physical construction would result directly from the amendment of the HRACALUP or from subsequent implementation of the HRACALUP, as amended. Although the proposed amendment may influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport, because of its goal to avoid the construction of new places of assembly that are inconsistent with the Airport's operations, it would be speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of that development or the types of environmental impacts that would be associated therewith. With that said, the amendment could serve to release existing constraints on the development of new commercial and industrial land uses by increasing the likelihood that such proposed land uses would be found consistent with the HRACALUP. That is, the revised definition of "Places of Assembly" proposed by the Commission for adoption is less restrictive than the definition provided in the 1992 HRACALUP.

The proposed amendment would not impact any other component (e.g., development restrictions or criteria) of the 1992 HRACALUP.

Project Location: Hemet-Ryan Airport is situated in the San Jacinto Valley, at the foot of the San Jacinto Mountains, in Riverside County, California. The Airport is located approximately 30 miles southeast of the City of Riverside, 37 miles southwest of the City of Palm Springs, and 70 miles northeast of the City of San Diego. The Airport primarily serves two cities -- Hemet and San Jacinto. The Airport is located within the City of Hemet, and six miles from the City of San Jacinto. (See Hemet-Ryan Airport Master Plan, prepared for the Riverside County Economic Development Agency (June 2004).)

Areas I and II of the HRACALUP cover 3,005.19 acres (excluding recorded subdivisions) in the City of Hemet and unincorporated areas in Riverside County. Per the applicable general plans, this includes 1,608.09 acres designated for residential uses; 172.36 acres designated for commercial uses; 721.84 acres designated for industrial uses; 404.55 acres designated for airport-related uses; and, 98.35 acres designated for other public uses. Areas I and II also cover portions of Assessor's Books 448, 456, 460, and 465, and are generally described as the geographic area located north of Simpson Road, south of Florida Avenue (State Highway Route 74), west of Lyon Avenue, and east of Winchester Road in the City of Hemet and the unincorporated San Jacinto Valley. Finally, these two areas include: Township 5 South, Range 1 West: All of Section 17 and Portions of Sections 8, 9, 16, 18, and 19; and Township 5 South, Range 2 West: All of Sections 23 and 24, and Portions of Sections 13, 25, and 26.

Initial Study: An Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA;" Pub. Resources Code, §21000 et seq.), in order to ascertain whether the proposed HRACALUP may have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of the Initial Study is attached to this Negative Declaration and is incorporated by this reference.

Proposed Finding: The Commission finds that, on the basis of the whole record before it, there is no substantial evidence showing that the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP may have a significant effect on the environment. This Initial Study and Negative Declaration reflects the Commission's independent judgment and analysis.

Date: _____

John J. G. Guerin
Principal Planner
Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Assessment No. ZAPEA01HR08

1. PROJECT TITLE

2009 Amendment To The 1992 Hemet-Ryan Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan ("HRACALUP").

2. LEAD AGENCY/PROJECT SPONSOR NAME AND ADDRESS

Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission ("Commission")
Riverside County Administrative Center
4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor
Riverside, California 92501

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER

John J. G. Guerin, Principal Planner
(951) 955-0982

4. HEMET-RYAN AIRPORT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

Hemet-Ryan Airport is owned by the County of Riverside, and administered by the Riverside County Economic Development Agency. The Airport has two (2) runways: Runway 5-23 is 4,315 feet in length and 100 feet wide, and can accommodate an 80,000-pound single-wheel aircraft; and, Runway 4-22 is 2,045 feet in length and 25 feet wide, and restricted to glider-related aircraft. As of June 2003, 247 aircraft were based at the Airport; and, in 2002, total annual aircraft operations, including sailplane operations, were estimated at approximately 70,000.

Hemet-Ryan Airport is situated in the San Jacinto Valley, at the foot of the San Jacinto Mountains, in Riverside County, California. The Airport is located approximately 30 miles southeast of the City of Riverside, 37 miles southwest of the City of Palm Springs, and 70 miles northeast of the City of San Diego. The Airport primarily serves two cities - Hemet and San Jacinto. The Airport is located within the City of Hemet, and six miles from the City of San Jacinto. Please see **Figure 1, Regional Map**, which depicts the relative location of Hemet-Ryan Airport. (See Hemet-Ryan Airport Master Plan, prepared for the Riverside County Economic Development Agency (June 2004).)

Areas I and II of the HRACALUP cover 3,005.19 acres (excluding recorded subdivisions) in the City of Hemet and unincorporated areas in Riverside County. Per the applicable general plans, this includes 1,608.09 acres designated for residential uses; 172.36 acres designated for commercial uses; 721.84 acres designated for industrial uses; 404.55 acres designated for airport-related uses; and, 98.35 acres designated for other public uses. These two areas also cover portions of Assessor's Books 448, 456, 460, and 465, and are generally described as the geographic area located north of Simpson Road,

south of Florida Avenue (State Highway Route 74), west of Lyon Avenue, and east of Winchester Road in the City of Hemet and the unincorporated San Jacinto Valley. Finally, Areas I and II may be defined as including: Township 5 South, Range 1 West: All of Section 17 and Portions of Sections 8, 9, 16, 18, and 19; and Township 5 South, Range 2 West: All of Sections 23 and 24, and Portions of Sections 13, 25, and 26.

5. GENERAL PLAN/COMMUNITY PLAN DESIGNATION

The applicable general plans include the City of Hemet General Plan and Riverside County General Plan. As to the City of Hemet General Plan, portions of Areas I and II are designated for industrial, commercial, residential R-I, residential R-III, rural residential, and office-related land uses. With regards to the Riverside County General Plan, portions of Areas I and II are designated for estate density residential - rural community, rural mountainous, open space - recreation, and public facilities-related land uses.

Areas I and II also include portions of Riverside County's San Jacinto Valley Area Plan, and the following specific plans within the City of Hemet: SP 05-3 (Sanderson Square); SP 07-3 (Stetson Crossing); PCD 79-91; and, PCD 79-93. No other applicable area plan, community plan, or specific plans are located within the Riverside County or City of Hemet portions of Areas I and II.

6. ZONING

Zoning within Areas I and II of the HRACALUP varies. Within the City of Hemet, the following zoning designations apply: A-2-C; A-2-C-1; A-2-C-10; C-1; C-2; C-M; M-1; M-2; PCD 79-91; PCD 79-93; R-3; R-A; R-P; SP 05-3; SP 07-3. Within Riverside County, the following zoning designations apply: A-1-2½; A-2-10; W-2-M-2½.

7. RELEVANT BACKGROUND/HISTORY

In 1967, the California Legislature established requirements for the creation of airport land use commissions ("ALUCs") in each county containing a public airport, as codified in the State Aeronautics Act. (Pub. Util. Code, §21670 et seq.) The legislative findings and declarations set forth in section 21670 of the Public Utilities Code declare that "[i]t is in the public interest to provide for the orderly development of each public use airport in this state and the area surrounding these airports so as to promote the overall goals and objectives of the California airport noise standards . . . and to prevent the creation of new noise and safety problems." (Pub. Util. Code, §21670, subd. (a)(1).)

In addition, section 21670 defines the purpose of the statutory scheme, which is "to protect public health, safety, and welfare by ensuring the orderly expansion of airports and the adoption of land use measures that minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within areas around public airports to the extent that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses." (Pub. Util. Code, §21670, subd. (a)(2).) In

order to accomplish this objective, ALUCs are vested with certain powers and duties, which include:

- (a) Assisting local agencies in ensuring compatible land uses . . . in the vicinity of existing airports to the extent that the land in the vicinity of those airports is not already devoted to incompatible uses;
- (b) Coordinating planning at the state, regional, and local levels so as to provide for the orderly development of air transportation, while at the same time protecting the public health, safety, and welfare;
- (c) Preparing and adopting an airport land use compatibility plan ; and
- (d) Reviewing the plans, regulations, and other actions of local agencies and airport operators for consistency with that plan.

(Pub. Util. Code, §21674, subds. (a)-(d).) However, ALUCs have no authority over existing land uses, even where such land uses are incompatible with the compatibility plan (Pub. Util. Code, §21674, subd. (a)), or the operation of airports (Pub. Util. Code, §21674, subd. (e)).

An ALUC's adoption of, or amendment to, a compatibility plan triggers action by local agencies with jurisdiction over the geographic area encompassed by the Airport Influence Area ("AIA"). Specifically, a local agency must submit its local land use plan(s) and/or regulation(s) (and any amendments thereto) to the ALUC in order for the ALUC to review the applicable documents and determine whether they are consistent with the compatibility plan. (Pub. Util. Code, §21676, subds. (a)-(b).) If the plan and/or regulation is considered inconsistent with the compatibility plan, the local agency's governing body may amend the document(s) to be consistent with the compatibility plan *or* "overrule" the ALUC's inconsistency determination after a hearing by a two-thirds vote. (*Ibid.*) In overruling the ALUC's determination, the local agency's governing body must make findings that its plan and/or regulation is consistent with the purposes of the State Aeronautics Act, as stated in Public Utilities Code section 21670. (*Ibid.*)

The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission was first established in 1971, pursuant to the State Aeronautics Act (Pub. Util. Code, §21001 et seq.), for the purpose of ensuring the orderly expansion of airports and promulgating appropriate land use measures for areas surrounding airports in Riverside County. (Pub. Util. Code, §21670, subd. (a)(2).) Pursuant to the directives of the State Aeronautics Act, the Commission drafted and adopted compatibility plans for public-use airports in Riverside County at various times from 1974 through the present date.

The Commission adopted a Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan for Hemet-Ryan Airport on March 18, 1992.

8. CALIFORNIA AIRPORT LAND USE PLANNING HANDBOOK

To assist ALUCs in the performance of their duties, the California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, prepared the *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* ("Handbook"). Pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 21674.7, subdivision (a), an ALUC that formulates, adopts, or amends a Compatibility Plan "shall be guided by" information in the Handbook.

The Handbook's purpose is to support and amplify the statewide requirements for airport land use compatibility planning. Accordingly, the Handbook provides guidance for establishing the airport influence area and designating airport zones, and includes suggested methods for establishing safety compatibility zones for general aviation runways. The Handbook points out that the choice of safety criteria appropriate for a particular zone is largely a function of risk acceptability. For example, land uses that are determined to represent intolerable risks, given their proximity to the airport, usually must be prohibited; where risks of a particular land use are considered significant but tolerable, establishment of restrictions may reduce the risk to an acceptable level; and uses that are intrinsically acceptable generally require no limitations.

9. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 1992 HRACALUP contains policies for determining consistency between development projects within the Airport's four relative risk areas (i.e., Area I; Area II; Transition Area; and, Area III) and the objectives set forth in the State Aeronautics Act. (Pub. Util. Code, §§21670-21679.5.) As previously discussed, those objectives call for the Commission to protect public health, safety, and welfare by ensuring the orderly expansion of airports *via* the adoption of land use measures that minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within areas around public airports to the extent those areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses. (Pub. Util. Code, §21670, subd. (a)(2).) (The previously adopted 1992 HRACALUP is incorporated by reference, and available for public review and inspection during ordinary business hours at the Commission's offices, located at the Riverside County Administrative Center, 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, California 92501. The HRACALUP also is available at the Commission's website: <http://www.rcaluc.org>.)

The project is the Commission's proposed amendment of the previously adopted HRACALUP. The amendment would revise the definition of "Places of Assembly" in Section II.E. (see pages 13-14 of the HRACALUP); the revised definition would be based on the occupancy level per square foot (pursuant to the California Building Code) and total square footage, rather than on an occupancy capacity of 50 persons.

As amended, the definition of "Places of Assembly" would read as follows, with additional text shown in *italics* and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~:

Any structure, public or private, or premise, or portion thereof ~~with a~~
~~capacity for occupancy of over 50 persons~~ *exceeding 1,500 square feet in*

area, where the Building Code would provide for occupancy levels of an intensity exceeding one person per 30 square feet, which is designed or used for entertainment, amusement, instruction, education, worship, deliberation, display, meeting, awaiting transportation or for the consumption of food and drink.

The list of examples of "Places of Assembly" in the HRACALUP would be amended to exclude recreational and entertainment facilities, shopping malls, major retail outlets, funeral homes, motels, banks, professional office buildings, and labor intensive industrial operations. The list would continue to include auditoriums, theaters, restaurants, churches, clubhouses, arenas, stadiums, circuses and bowling alleys.

As previously mentioned, the HRACALUP identifies four relative risk areas: Area I (Area of Extreme Risk); Area II (Area of High Risk); Transition Area; and, Area III (Area of Moderate Risk). Each risk area is defined by the typical flight paths of aircraft using the Airport, and the existing and projected noise contours for the Airport. In addition, each successive area is influenced less by relative safety and noise concerns. As provided in the HRACALUP, "Places of Assembly" are considered an incompatible land use within Areas I and II, and conditionally compatible (subject to the Commission's discretionary review) within the Transition Area and Area III.

The proposed amendment is regulatory in nature, and no physical construction would result directly from the amendment of the HRACALUP or from subsequent implementation of the HRACALUP, as amended. Although the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP may influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport, it would be speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of that development or the types of environmental impacts that would be associated therewith. With that said, the amendment could serve to release existing constraints to the development of new commercial and industrial land uses by increasing the likelihood that such proposed developments would be found consistent with the HRACALUP. That is, the revised definition of "Places of Assembly" proposed by the Commission for adoption is less restrictive than the definition provided in the 1992 HRACALUP.

The proposed amendment would not impact any other component of the 1992 HRACALUP.

10. DISPLACED DEVELOPMENT

The phrase "potential for displaced development" is defined in this section to assist the Commission, local land use agencies, and all other interested parties in understanding how the potential for displaced development may arise in the context of formulating and adopting a proposed compatibility plan. The potential for displaced development results from placing certain land use density or intensity restrictions on development in order to ensure the orderly expansion of airports, and to minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within certain areas surrounding public airports, which

may have the consequence, notwithstanding existing general plan designations and zoning, of displacing development to other areas.

As defined, adopting the proposed amendment does not create any new potential for the HRACALUP to displace development that would otherwise occur. As discussed above, and further below, the proposed amendment to the definition of "Places of Assembly" would result in less restrictive development criteria than currently provided in the HRACALUP; therefore, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not result in any new potential for displacement within Areas I and II, where such land uses are considered incompatible.

11. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

As adopted in 1992, the HRACALUP defines "Places of Assembly" to include "[a]ny structure, public or private, or premise, or portion thereof with a capacity for occupancy of over 50 persons, which is designed or used for entertainment, amusement, instruction, education, worship, deliberation, display, meeting, awaiting transportation or for the consumption of food and drink," and prohibits such uses in Airport Area I and in Airport Area II (except within the Transition Area at the outer edge of Area II). This definition is not utilized in any other compatibility plan adopted by the Commission and has resulted in proposed retail projects being determined to be inconsistent in Areas I and II.

The proposed amendment of this definition would result in proposed retail developments that meet certain occupancy and square footage criteria being deemed consistent with the HRACALUP, while still prohibiting those uses that are more intensive than retail, including, but not limited to, any areas in excess of 1,500 square feet where intensity levels exceeding one person per 30 square feet are permitted pursuant to tables in the California Building Code. Uses listed as "assembly areas," pursuant to the California Building Code, and as included in Exhibit C-1 of Appendix C of the Handbook (as well as Appendix C of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan), include auditoriums, churches and chapels, conference rooms, dance floors, dining rooms, drinking establishments, gaming areas, exhibit rooms, gymnasiums, lobbies accessory to assembly occupancies, lodge rooms, lounges, reviewing stands, stadiums, and waiting areas. Additional areas that would qualify as "places of assembly" pursuant to the proposed definition include auction rooms, bowling alleys, classrooms, and the decks of skating rinks and swimming pools.

Notably, while "places of assembly" are prohibited in Areas I and II under the HRACALUP, commercial development is listed as "discretionary," even though almost any commercial land use would also be a "place of assembly" pursuant to the existing definition.

The City of Hemet requested that the Commission consider this proposed amendment. If adopted, this amended definition would be applicable throughout the HRACALUP's four relative risk areas. With that said, at the time of this writing, the portions of unincorporated Riverside County within Areas I and II do not include any properties

designated for commercial or industrial development. Therefore, from a practical perspective, the proposed amendment would only be of relevance to the portion of Areas I and II located within the City of Hemet. Please see Exhibits 1 and 2 of the HRACALUP, as reproduced here, for a depiction of the geographic areas that may be affected by the revised definition of "Places of Assembly."

12. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING

The central area of the City of Hemet lies directly to the east of the Airport; the City is expanding westward, both north and south of the Airport. Lands to the west of the Airport remain generally rural.

13. OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

Input and comments from other agencies, including the City of Hemet and County of Riverside and adjacent jurisdictions, will be considered by the Commission. However, the Commission may adopt the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP without the approval of the affected local agencies.

A copy of the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP will be submitted to the California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 21675, subdivision (d).

SLIPSHEET FOR FIGURE 1, REGIONAL MAP

SLIPSHEET FOR EXHIBIT 1, DEPICTION OF REVIEW AREA 1 FROM 1992 HRACALUP

SLIPSHEET FOR EXHIBIT 2, DEPICTION OF REVIEW AREA 2 FROM 1992 HRACALUP

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

None of the environmental topics below would be potentially affected by the proposed project, because none of the impacts are considered a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics/Visual Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service System |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | |

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

On the basis of this 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 the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, but, nonetheless, one or more of the mitigation measures described in this document have been recommended for inclusion into the proposed project. Therefore, 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 a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect: (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." 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, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects: (1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards; and (2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

By: _____
John J. G. Guerin, Principal Planner
Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission

INITIAL STUDY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

In accordance with CEQA, this Initial Study has been prepared to analyze the proposed project to determine whether any potential significant impacts upon the environment would result from implementation of the proposed project. In accordance with section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines, this Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the lead agency, the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, in consultation with other jurisdictional agencies, in order to determine whether a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report is required for the proposed project. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the decision-makers, affected agencies, and the public of potential environmental impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (*e.g.*, the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (*e.g.*, the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - (a) *Earlier Analysis Used.* Identify and state where they are available for review.

- (b) *Impacts Adequately Addressed.* Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - (c) *Mitigation Measures.* For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6. Supporting Information Sources: References to information sources for potential impacts have been incorporated into the analysis. A source list is provided following the checklist. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.
- 7. The following environmental analysis checklist is based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and was prepared to identify the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. After each environment topic is assessed, an analysis of the basis for the assessment is provided.
- 8. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - (a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a level less than significant.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

AESTHETICS				
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	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 within a state 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 which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✓	
(e) Interfere with the night time use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?			✓	

SOURCES: City of Hemet General Plan EIR, 1991 (SCH No. 1990020515; "Hemet EIR"); Riverside County's San Jacinto Valley Area Plan ("SJVAP") -- Figure 6, Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy, and Figure 9, Scenic Highways; Riverside County EIR No. 441 (SCH No. 2002051143; "EIR No. 441") [addressing the environmental impacts of the 2003 Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan]; Riverside County Ordinance No. 655.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (e): By way of background, State Highway Route 74, which is in the vicinity of the Airport, is a State Eligible Scenic Highway. In addition, the HRACALUP would apply to proposed land use development within a 45-mile radius of Mt. Palomar Observatory (Light Zone B).

However, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not directly affect a scenic vista, damage scenic resources, degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings, create a new source of light or glare, or interfere with Mt. Palomar Observatory, and, as such, would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts to aesthetics. Further, the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of aesthetic impacts that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, the proposed amendment would not result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant aesthetic impacts. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant aesthetic impacts. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan and City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on aesthetics. Moreover, with respect to the creation of new sources of light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, any proposed development within the area would be subject to standard conditions from the Commission, County or City restricting lighting that could interfere with the safe operation of aircraft.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: Development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 9 and 10 in section C.f. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan and strategies 1 through 6 of the Resource Management chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan.

Riverside County already has committed to mitigate development-related impacts to aesthetics through compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.4.1A, 4.4.2A, 4.4.2B, 4.4.2C, 4.4.2D, and 4.4.2E, as specified in County EIR No. 441. In addition, development within the unincorporated areas shall comply with the lighting restrictions imposed by Riverside County Ordinance No. 655.

In addition, pursuant to the standards that the Commission applies in evaluating projects, the following uses shall be prohibited throughout the Hemet-Ryan Airport AIA:

- (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
- (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
- (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 a Williamson Act contract?			✓	

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
(c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			✓	
(d) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625, Right-To-Farm)?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR and EIR No. 441.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (d): The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not: (a) directly convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (collectively, "Farmland") to a non-agricultural use; (b) conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; (c) involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of Farmland to a non-agricultural use; or, (d) cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property. Further, the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts to agricultural resources that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be

accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts to agricultural resources. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts to agricultural resources. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan and City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on agricultural resources.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: Development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 8, 9, 10, and 12 in section A.b. and strategies 3 and 5 in section E.a. of the Community Development chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan.

AIR QUALITY				
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			✓	

AIR QUALITY

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
(c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			✓	
(d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			✓	
(e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR and EIR No. 441.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (e): The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not directly conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard; expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people; and, as such, would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts to air quality. Further, the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the Riverside County and City of Hemet general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of air quality impacts that would be

associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant air quality impacts. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant air quality impacts. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan and City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on air quality.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: Development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 18 in section D.h. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within the unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.5.1A, 4.5.1B, and 4.5.1C, as specified in EIR No. 441.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	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 an endangered or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?			✓	
(b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			✓	
(c) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			✓	
(d) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally-protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, <i>etc.</i>) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			✓	
(e) 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?			✓	
(f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			✓	
(g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR and EIR No. 441.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (g): The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not directly impact biological resources or their habitat, or conflict with applicable policies protecting biological resources or an adopted or approved habitat conservation plan, and, as such, would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts to biological resources. Further, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts to biological resources that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts to biological resources. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County

General Plan or the City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on biological resources.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: Development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1, 2, and 3 in section E.a., strategy 2 in section E.c., and strategies 1 through 5 in section E.d. of the Resources Management chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.6.1A, 4.6.1B, 4.6.1C, 4.6.2A, 4.6.3A, 4.6.4A, 4.6.4B, 4.6.5A, 4.6.5B, 4.6.6A, 4.6.6B, 4.6.7A, 4.6.7B, 4.6.7C, 4.6.7D, and 4.6.7E, as specified in EIR No. 441.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
(a) Alter or destroy a historic or archaeological site?			✓	
(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?			✓	
(c) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?			✓	
(d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			✓	
(e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			✓	
(f) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR and EIR No. 441.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (f): The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the

environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not directly cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or an archaeological resource; directly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, and, as such, would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts to cultural resources. Further, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts to cultural resources that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts to cultural resources. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts to cultural resources. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or the City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would result in any

significant indirect impacts on cultural resources.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: With regards to historic resources, in particular, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 11 in section E.f. of the Resource Management chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.7.1A, 4.7.1B and 4.7.1C, as specified in EIR No. 441.

With regards to archaeological resources, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 11 in section E.f. of the Resources Management chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.7.1A, 4.7.1B, and 4.7.1C, as specified in EIR No. 441.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	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:			✓	
(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?				
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
(iv) Landslides?				
(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			✓	
(c) Change the deposition, siltation or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?			✓	
(d) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-			✓	

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?				
(e) 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?			✓	
(f) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			✓	
(g) Change topography or ground surface relief features?			✓	
(h) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?			✓	
(i) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?			✓	
(j) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off the project site?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR; EIR No. 441; and, SJVAP -- Figure 12, Seismic Hazards, Figure 13, Steep Slopes, and, Figure 14, Slope Instability.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (j): To preface, there are no mapped fault zones in Areas I and II of the HRACALUP, although the area is close to the alignment of the San Jacinto Fault. In addition, Areas I and II exhibit high susceptibility to liquefaction, are very active in terms of geology, seismicity and landslide risk potential, and also contain areas of steep slopes in the unincorporated portions.

With that said, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. The project will not change topography or ground surface relief features, will not create cut or fill slopes, and involves no grading. The project also does not involve land disturbance and, therefore, will not result in a change in deposition, siltation, or erosion, or in an increase in wind erosion or blowsand. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides; result in

substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, potentially resulting in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse; be located on expansive soil; or have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks; and, as such, would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts to geology and soils. Further, the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts to geology and soils that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts to geology and soils. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts to geology and soils. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or the City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on geology and soils.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: With regards to liquefaction potential zones, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 9 in section D.a. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.10.3A and 4.10.3B, as specified in EIR No. 441.

With regards to potential seismic ground shaking, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 9 in section D.a. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.10.2A, 4.10.2B, and 4.10.2 C, as specified in EIR No. 441.

With regards to landslide risk potential, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 9 in section D.a. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with applicable Land Use Element and Safety Element policies.

With regards to issues associated with steep slopes, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1, 2, and 3 in section E.b. of the Resources Management chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan, which address ways to minimize impacts to landforms.

With regards to environmental concerns relating to soils, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 9 and 10 in section C.f. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan and strategies 1 through 6 in section E.a. of the Resources Management chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.10.7A, 4.10.9A, 4.10.9B, and 4.10.9C, as specified in EIR No. 441.

With regards to issues associated with erosion, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 9 and 10 in section C.f. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan and strategies 1 through 6 in section E.a. of the Resources Management chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.10.9A, 4.10.9B, and 4.10.9C, as specified in EIR No. 441.

Finally, with regards to wind erosion and blowsand, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 9 and 10 in section C.f. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan and strategies 1 through 6 in section E.a. of the Resources Management chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measure 4.10.8A, as specified in EIR No. 441.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<hr/> 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 handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			✓	
(d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			✓	
(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of the public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			✓	
(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			✓	
(g) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?			✓	
(h) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?			✓	
(i) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			✓	
(j) 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?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR; EIR No. 441; SJVAP -- Figure 11, Wildlife Susceptibility; HRACALUP (1992); and, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (January 2002), California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (j): Airports are industrial uses and have the potential to create safety hazards related to aircraft activity. Pursuant to the State Aeronautics Act, the HRACALUP establishes the criteria by which safety hazards relating to aircraft activity would be evaluated. These criteria are intended to reduce the risk of exposure to the hazards of an off-airport aircraft accident by limiting residential densities and concentrations of people in locations near Hemet-Ryan Airport. The risks of aircraft accident occurrence also are reduced by policies limiting the height of structures, trees, and other objects that might penetrate airport airspace as defined by Part 77 of the Federal Aviation Regulations.

The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Moreover, the proposed amendment does not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; the emission or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste; or the location of a building, structure, or public facility on a hazardous materials site compiled by the State of California pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5. Areas I and II also are not susceptible to wildland fire hazards.

Therefore, the proposed amendment would not affect the incidence of hazardous material safety hazards in the area; result in hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; affect any sites included on a list of hazardous materials sites; create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; or affect emergency response plans or the incidence of wildland fires in the area. Further, by their very nature, airport land use compatibility plans decrease airport-related safety hazards by limiting development of land uses within the vicinity of an airport that are considered incompatible with aeronautical operations. In summary, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts relating to hazards and hazardous materials; and, the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of those uses that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but would not be included in the proposed definition within Areas I and II, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Although the proposed amendment would define "Places of Assembly" to include fewer incompatible land uses than provided in the existing definition, Commission staff was guided by the Handbook in preparing the proposed amendment (see Pub. Util. Code, §21674.7) and the proposed amendment is consistent with the Handbook's treatment of "assembly areas." In addition, Commission staff has evaluated the potential safety-

related hazards and has determined that the proposed amendment does not impermissibly increase such hazards.

Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts to hazards or hazardous materials that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts to hazards or hazardous materials. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts to hazards or hazardous materials. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or the City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on hazards or hazardous materials.

On an overall basis, the HRACALUP, even with the proposed amendment, may result in a reduction of the potential build-out of Areas I and II in relation to the levels that may be expected pursuant to the General Plans of Riverside County or the City of Hemet. However, this reduction potential is not new, but was established by adoption of the HRACALUP in 1992; the proposed amendment would lessen the reduction potential by implementing a less restrictive definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, if build-out is precluded, this reduction would achieve the objectives set forth in the State Aeronautics Act (Pub. Util. Code, §§21670-21679.5), which call for the Commission to protect public health, safety, and welfare by ensuring the orderly expansion of airports and the adoption of land use measures that minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within areas around public airports to the extent

that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses. (Pub. Util. Code, §21670, subd. (a)(2).)

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: With regards to hazards and hazardous materials, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 6 in section D.d. and strategy 4 of section D.g. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan, which address the safe generation, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials.

With regards to the airport-related thresholds, in addition to the AIA development restrictions identified in the "Aesthetics" analysis above, any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation shall be prohibited throughout the portion of the planning area subject to the jurisdiction of the County of Riverside. Development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategy 1 and strategies 5 through 7 in section D.g. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			✓	
(b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			✓	
(c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			✓	

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
(d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			✓	
(e) Result in changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?			✓	
(f) Result in changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?			✓	
(g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			✓	
(h) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			✓	
(i) Include new or retrofitted Stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as water quality treatment basins and constructed treatment wetlands, the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g., increased vectors and odors)?			✓	
(j) 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?			✓	
(k) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			✓	
(l) 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?			✓	
(m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR; City of Hemet Resolution No. 2993; EIR No. 441; and, SJVAP -- Figure 10, Flood Hazards.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (m): The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Although some portions of Area II are located in the 100-year flood plain associated with Salt Creek, because the proposed amendment does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment, it would not place housing or structures in a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not violate any water quality standards; affect groundwater supplies; substantially alter drainage patterns; or expose people or structures to a significant risk involving flooding, seiche, tsunami or mudflow; and, as such, would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts to hydrology and water quality. Further, the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts to hydrology and water quality that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts to hydrology and water quality. Moreover, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts to hydrology and water quality. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction

indirectly result from the proposed amendment, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or the City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on hydrology and water quality.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: With regards to water quality-related impacts, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 5 in section E.c. of the Resources Management chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan and strategy 5 in section D.b. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.15.4A, 4.17.2A, 4.17.5A, 4.17.5B, 4.17.5C, 4.17.5D, and 4.17.5E, as specified in EIR No. 441.

With regards to floodplains-related impacts, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 5 in section C.c. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan and strategies 1 through 6 in section D.b. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.9.1A, 4.9.1B, 4.9.1C, 4.9.1D, 4.9.2A, 4.9.2B, 4.9.2C, and 4.9.2D, as specified in EIR No. 441.

LAND USE AND PLANNING				
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
(a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?			✓	
(b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?			✓	
(c) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?			✓	
(d) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?			✓	

- | | |
|--|---|
| (e) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses? | ✓ |
| (f) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)? | ✓ |
| (g) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? | ✓ |
-

SOURCES: Map, Existing General Plan for Areas I and II, City of Hemet; Maps, Proposed and Approved Projects in Areas I and II, City of Hemet; List, Proposed and Approved Projects in Areas I and II, City of Hemet; General Plan Amendment 02-01 Supplemental EIR, City of Hemet (SCH No. 2002121079); City of Hemet General Plan, 1992; and, Maps, Riverside County Planning Department.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (g): Within Areas I and II of the HRACALUP, the City of Hemet has designated 172.36 acres for commercial development, and 1,126.39 acres for industrial development, including the 404.55-acre Airport site. Assuming floor area ratios (square footage of building area divided by square footage of net site area) of 0.32 for commercial development and 0.40 for industrial development (excluding the Airport site), Areas I and II could potentially allow for up to 2,402,561 square feet of commercial floor area and 12,577,340 square feet of industrial floor area. (These floor area ratios are provided in Table IV-1, on page IV-3, of the General Plan Amendment 02-01 Supplemental EIR, City of Hemet.) If development were to proceed in accordance with maximum floor area ratios of 0.40 for commercial development and 0.60 for industrial development as specified in the City's General Plan, Areas I and II could potentially allow for up to 3,003,201 square feet of commercial floor area and to 18,866,010 square feet of industrial floor area. The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would result in less restrictive development criteria being in place for "Places of Assembly," thereby potentially reducing the number of proposed land uses that would be deemed inconsistent with the HRACALUP.

Although the proposed amendment would result in less restrictive development criteria for "Places of Assembly" in the HRACALUP, the proposed amendment does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not physically divide an established community or conflict with any applicable plan, and, as such, would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts to land use and planning. Further, the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are

included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not impact assessments regarding the compatibility of residential land uses with Airport operations (as the definition of "Places of Assembly" addresses commercial and industrial-related land uses), and would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of land use and planning impacts that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant land use and planning impacts. Moreover, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant land use and planning impacts. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or the City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on land use and planning.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: None.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	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?			✓	
(c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?			✓	
(d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR and EIR No. 441.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (d): The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not 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, or result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. As such, the proposed amendment would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts to mineral resources. Further, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts to mineral resources that

would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts to mineral resources. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts to mineral resources. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or the City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on mineral resources.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: None.

NOISE

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings				
Where indicated below, the appropriate Noise Acceptability Rating(s) has been checked.				
NA - Not Applicable	A - Generally Acceptable	B - Conditionally Acceptable		
C - Generally Unacceptable	D - Land Use Discouraged			
Would the project result in:				
(a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/>			✓	
(b) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/>			✓	
(c) Railroad noise? NA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/>			✓	
(d) Highway noise? NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/>			✓	
(e) Other noise? NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/>			✓	
(f) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			✓	
(g) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			✓	
(h) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			✓	
(i) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR; General Plan Amendment 02-01 Supplemental EIR, City of Hemet; and, EIR No. 441.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (i): Airports are industrial uses and have the potential to create airport-related noise. Pursuant to the State Aeronautics Act, the HRACALUP establishes the criteria by which the public's exposure to airport-related noise would be evaluated. These criteria are intended to reduce the public's exposure to noise by limiting residential densities and concentrations of people in Areas I and II, as defined in the HRACALUP. (See Exhibits 1 and 2, *supra*.)

Notably, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment, and does not include any changes in aircraft or airport operations that would generate additional noise. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not result in the exposure of people to increased noise or vibration levels, and, as such, would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts related to noise. Indeed, the HRACALUP, with or without the proposed amendment, is designed to limit the exposure of people to increased aircraft noise levels, which is an important objective of the State Aeronautics Act. Further, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts related to noise that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts related to noise. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing,

facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts related to noise. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or the City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts related to noise.

In summary, the HRACALUP, even with the proposed amendment, may result in a reduction of the potential build-out of Areas I and II in relation to the levels that may be expected pursuant to the Riverside County General Plan or City of Hemet General Plan. However, as previously discussed, this reduction potential is not new; instead, the proposed amendment would lessen the displacement potential existing under the current version of the HRACALUP by defining "Places of Assembly" in a less restrictive manner. Moreover, if this reduction occurs, it is intended to achieve the objectives set forth in the State Aeronautics Act (Pub. Util. Code, §§21670-21679.5), which call for the Commission to protect public health, safety, and welfare by ensuring the orderly expansion of airports and the adoption of land use measures that minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within areas around public airports to the extent that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses. (Pub. Util. Code, §21670, subd. (a)(2).)

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: With regards to airport-related noise, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 3, 7, and 8 in section D.c. and strategies 2 and 3 in section D.g. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measure 4.13.2D, as specified in EIR No. 441.

With regards to railroad-related noise, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 11 in section D.c. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan, which address ways to reduce potential noise impacts. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.13.4A and 4.13.4B, as specified in EIR No. 441.

With regards to highway-related noise, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 11 in section D.c. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of

Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.13.2A, 4.13.2B, and 4.13.2C, as specified in EIR No. 441.

With regards to other noise, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 11 in section D.c. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.13.1A, 4.13.1B, 4.13.3A, 4.13.3B, and 4.13.3C, 4.13.4A, and 4.13.4B, as specified in EIR No. 441.

POPULATION AND HOUSING				
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	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 (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			✓	
(b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			✓	
(c) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?			✓	
(d) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			✓	
(e) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?			✓	
(f) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR and EIR No. 441.

ANALYSIS:

Threshold (a) - (f): The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or displace substantial numbers of people. As such, the proposed amendment would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts to population and housing. Further, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in

the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." In any event, the proposed amendment would not impact assessments regarding the compatibility of residential land uses with Airport operations (as the definition of "Places of Assembly" addresses commercial and industrial-related land uses). Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts to population and housing that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts to population and housing. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts to population and housing. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on population and housing.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: None required.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: Development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of the strategies in the City of Hemet General Plan's Housing Element.

PUBLIC SERVICES				
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
(i) Fire services?			✓	
(ii) Police and sheriff services?			✓	
(iii) Schools?			✓	
(iv) Libraries?			✓	
(v) Health services?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR and EIR No. 441.

ANALYSIS:

Threshold (a): The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, would not induce substantial population growth in an area and, therefore, would not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. As such, the proposed amendment would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts related to public services. Further, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are

included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts to public services that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts to public services. Moreover, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts to public services. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or the City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on public services.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: With regards to fire services, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 6 in section C.h. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter and strategies 1 through 4 in section D.e. of the Public Health and Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan.

With regards to police and sheriff services, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 5 in section C.g. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter and strategies 1 through 4 in section D.f. of the Public Health and

Safety chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.15.2A and 4.15.2D, as specified in EIR No. 441.

With regards to schools, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementaiton of strategies 1 through 3 in section C.1. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan.

With regards to libraries, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 and 2 in section C.k. of the Public Services and Facilities chapeter of the City of Hemet General Plan.

RECREATION				
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			✓	
(b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			✓	
(c) Is the project located within a C.S.A. or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR and EIR No. 441.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (c): The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities and does not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment, and, as such, would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts to recreation. Further, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts related to recreation that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts related to recreation. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts related to recreation. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or the City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on recreation.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: Development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 8, and strategy 11, in section C.f. and strategies 1 through 3 in section E.a. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
(a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (<i>i.e.</i> , result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			✓	
(b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard 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) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?			✓	
(e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (<i>e.g.</i> , sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (<i>e.g.</i> , farm equipment)?			✓	
(f) Result in inadequate emergency access?			✓	
(g) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			✓	
(h) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (<i>e.g.</i> , bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			✓	
(i) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?			✓	
(j) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?			✓	
(k) Result in impacts to bike trails?			✓	

SOURCES: Hemet EIR and EIR No. 441.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (k): The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not cause an increase in traffic,

substantially increase design hazards, result in inadequate emergency access or parking capacity, or conflict with applicable alternative transportation plans. As such, the proposed amendment would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts related to traffic. Further, the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of traffic impacts that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant traffic impacts. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant traffic impacts. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or the City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on traffic.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: Development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of the 29 strategies in section C.b. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.16.1A and 4.16.1B, as specified in EIR No. 441.

With regards to bike trails, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 8, and strategy 11, in section C.f. and strategies 1 through 3 in section E.a. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	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 storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effect?			✓	
(d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			✓	
(e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demands 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 (including the County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?			✓	

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
(h) Impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			✓	
a. Electricity?				
b. Natural gas?				
c. Communication systems?				
d. Stormwater drainage?				
e. Street lighting?				
f. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?				
g. Other governmental services?				
h. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?				

SOURCES: Hemet EIR and EIR No. 441.

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (h): The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not result in the construction of new wastewater or stormwater facilities, and would not require additional water supplies, or wastewater or landfill capacity, and, as such, would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts to utilities and service systems. Further, the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts to utilities and service

systems that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts to utilities and service systems. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts to utilities and service systems. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on utilities and service systems.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: As to water supplies and treatment facilities, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 12 in section C.a., strategies 1 through 3 in section C.d., strategies 1 through 4 in section C.e., strategy 1 in section C.j., and strategies 1 through 5 in section C.l. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.17.1A, 4.17.1B, 4.17.1C, 4.17.1D, 4.17.2A, 4.17.3A, 4.17.4A, 4.17.4B, 4.17.4C, 4.17.5A, 4.17.5B, 4.17.5C, 4.17.5D, and 4.17.5E, as specified in EIR No. 441.

As to wastewater treatment facilities and sewer-related issues, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 12 in section C.a., strategies 1 through 3 in section C.d., strategies 1 through 4 in section C.e., strategy 1 in section C.j., and strategies 1 through 5 in section C.l. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.15.4A, 4.17.5A, and 4.17.5E, as specified in EIR No. 441.

As to solid wastes, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 12 in section C.a., strategies 1 through 3 in section C.d., strategies 1 through 4 in section C.e., strategy 1 in section C.j., and strategies 1 through 5 in section C.l. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.15.3E and 4.15.3F, as specified in EIR No. 441.

As to utilities generally, development within the City of Hemet shall be subject to the City's implementation of strategies 1 through 12 in section C.a., strategies 1 through 3 in section C.d., strategies 1 through 4 in section C.e., strategy 1 in section C.j., and strategies 1 through 5 in section C.l. of the Public Services and Facilities chapter of the City of Hemet General Plan. Development within unincorporated areas of Riverside County shall comply with Mitigation Measures 4.8.1A and 4.8.1B, as specified in Final EIR No. 441.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	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, 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 the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?			✓	
(c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?			✓	
(d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			✓	

ANALYSIS:

Thresholds (a) - (d): The proposed amendment to the HRACALUP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not have the potential to degrade the

quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory; have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable; or have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. As such, the proposed amendment would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts in this regard. Further, the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in unincorporated Riverside County or the City of Hemet above those projected for these areas in the jurisdictions' respective general plans, the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in the certified general plan environmental documentation.

The proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of Hemet-Ryan Airport by facilitating development of some land uses in Areas I and II that are included in the existing definition of "Places of Assembly" but excluded from the proposed definition, while retaining existing constraints on development of those uses that would continue to be included in the definition. Importantly, the proposed amendment would not result in any new constraint on development as it proposes less restrictive development criteria than the existing definition of "Places of Assembly." Moreover, any potential indirect effect that may arise is uncertain from a timing and location standpoint, and it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development or the types of impacts to wildlife, their habitats, important examples of California history, or human beings that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future development to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Because such shifts, if they do occur, cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that such shifts, if any, will be significant. Accordingly, absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

In addition, nothing in the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP would result in indirect impacts like, for example, the construction of housing or other uses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure, all of which would necessitate an analysis of potentially significant impacts to wildlife, their habitats, important examples of California history, or human beings. Moreover, the proposed amendment would not result in the displacement of existing housing, structures, or people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing, facilities, or infrastructure, which may result in potentially significant impacts to wildlife, their habitats, important examples of California history, or human beings. Therefore, any further analysis necessarily will occur if future shifts in development or construction result in a "project" subject to further CEQA compliance. All such projects will be required to comply with CEQA, necessitating preparation of a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration, or an EIR. This project-level environmental documentation ensures that if future shifts in development/construction indirectly result from the proposed amendment to the HRACALUP, these subsequent actions will not evade further project-level environmental review.

Further, as noted above, because implementation of the proposed amendment would not increase the levels of development in Areas I and II above those projected in the Riverside County General Plan or the City of Hemet General Plan, and because the environmental effects of such development were already adequately analyzed at the general plan level, there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the proposed amendment would result in any significant indirect impacts on wildlife, their habitats, important examples of California history, or human beings.

Lastly, because the proposed amendment is regulatory in nature and will not result in any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment, it has no potential to create cumulatively significant environmental impacts. Indeed, the HRACALUP, with or without the proposed amendment, serves as a mitigation plan designed to avoid certain noise and safety impacts that might otherwise be cumulatively significant.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: No mitigation necessary.

OTHER APPLICABLE/ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES: None.

SOURCES

The following documents referenced in this Initial Study are incorporated by this reference and are available for public inspection and review, upon request to John J. G. Guerin, at the Riverside County Administrative Center, 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, California, 92501:

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, DIVISION OF AERONAUTICS.

California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, 2002. (Also available for review at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut/documents/ALUPHComplete-7-02rev.pdf>.)

CITY OF HEMET, CALIFORNIA.

City of Hemet General Plan. 1992.

City of Hemet General Plan Amendment 02-1 Supplemental EIR.

List of Proposed and Approved Projects in Areas I and II.

Map of Existing General Plan for Areas I and II.

Map of Proposed and Approved Projects in Areas I and II.

Resolution No. 2993.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA.

Ordinance No. 655, An Ordinance of Riverside County Regulating Light Pollution. June 1988. (Also available for review at <http://www.clerkoftheboard.co.riverside.ca.us/ords/600/655.htm>.)

Riverside County General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Environmental Impact Report No. 441, State Clearinghouse No. 2002051143). October 2003. (Also available for review at <http://www.rctlma.org/genplan/default.aspx>.)

Riverside County Integrated Project: San Jacinto Valley Area Plan. October 2003. (Also available for review at http://www.rctlma.org/genplan/content/ap2/sjvap.html#TOC1_1.)

RIVERSIDE COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION.

Hemet-Ryan Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan. 1992. (Also available for review at www.rcaluc.org/plan_old.asp.)

RIVERSIDE COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Hemet-Ryan Airport Master Plan. 2004. (Also available for review at <http://www.rivcoeda.org/Default.aspx?tabid=519>.)