

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

California Public Resources Code Section 21003(f) states: "...it is the policy of the state that...[a]ll persons and public agencies involved in the environmental review process be responsible for carrying out the process in the most efficient, expeditious manner in order to conserve the available financial, governmental, physical, and social resources with the objective that those resources may be better applied toward the mitigation of actual significant effects on the environment." This policy is reflected in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.2(a), which states that "[a]n EIR [environmental impact report] shall identify and focus on the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project" and Section 15143, which states that "[t]he EIR shall focus on the significant effects on the environment." CEQA Guidelines Section 15128 requires that an environmental impact report (EIR) contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the Draft EIR (see Chapter 5, *Environmental Analysis*).

This chapter includes the analysis of the environmental topics where the project would have either no impact or a less-than-significant impact, as shown herein. Air Quality, Cultural Resources (and Paleontological Resources from Geology and Soils), Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, Recreation, Transportation, and Tribal Cultural Resources are analyzed in Chapter 5 of this EIR.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Biological Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire

8.1 AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A scenic vista generally refers to a view that possesses visual and aesthetic qualities of high value to the community, aesthetic value is not limited to natural and rural viewsheds but can also be held in historic structures and districts, architectural design, streetscapes, etc.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

No Impact. There is no officially designated state scenic highway within 10 miles of the project site. The closest eligible state scenic highways is Interstate (I-) 15 in Corona, approximately 12 miles southwest of the project site (Caltrans 2022). The project site is not visible from these officially designated or eligible state scenic highways. Considering the distance from the eligible scenic highway and the intervening development, the project site is not visible from a state scenic highway, and no impact is anticipated.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is in an urbanized area and is zoned R-1-7000 (Single Family Residential), R-3-1500 (Multifamily Residential), PF (Public Facilities), CR (Commercial Retail), and CF (Commercial General) (City of Riverside 2007). Implementation of the proposed project under Options 1 and 3 would demolish all existing buildings on the project site. Under Option 2, the existing Lincoln High School would be retained. There are no regulations governing scenic quality in the project area. Although the proposed project would change the existing visual quality of the project site and the surrounding area, the project site is not a part of any scenic viewshed and project implementation would not conflict with any regulations governing scenic quality. Impacts would not be significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The existing light on the project site is limited to streetlights and security lighting for the high school and other existing uses. Implementation of the proposed project would allow for intensification of existing land uses and new development with associated lighting.

Under Options 1 and 3, the nighttime lighting would include security and safety lighting for the elementary school and the high school, and no nighttime lighting for the grass play fields or hardcourts would be provided. The building materials would not be of highly reflective materials such as metal or glass. Furthermore, sensitive residential uses are present north across 13th Street and east across Victoria Avenue, and there are no sensitive uses west across Howard Avenue or south across 14th Street. Therefore, Options 1 and 3 would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Option 2 would provide nighttime lighting for the grass play fields and the basketball courts. No light plans are available at this time, but it is assumed for the purposes of this analysis that up to four light poles not exceeding 70 feet with LED luminaires would be installed, two along the northern boundary of the large joint-use grass play fields and two along the southern border of the small grass play fields (see Figure 3-6, *Option 2 Site Plan*). The luminaires on the two light poles on the north side would be directed south to light the grass fields, and the two light poles on the south side would have luminaires on both sides to light the grass play fields to the north and the basketball courts to the south. It is anticipated that the average light levels could range from 30

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

foot-candles (fc) to 50 fc, adequate to use the fields and the courts during evening hours, but the light levels would not be designed to meet the California Interscholastic Federation field lighting recommendations for competitive events.

The general benchmarks for light levels are shown in Table 8-1, *General Light Levels Benchmark*. The City of Riverside has no established foot-candle level standards for spill light impact to sensitive land uses. Industry-standard for spill light impact generally ranges from 0.2 fc to 0.8 fc, which represents light levels between deep twilight to twilight for sensitive uses such as residential uses.

Table 8-1 General Light Levels Benchmark

Outdoor Light	Foot-Candles
Direct Sunlight	10,000
Full Daylight	1,000
Overcast Day	100
Dusk	10
Twilight	1
Deep Twilight	0.1
Full Moon	0.01
Quarter Moon	0.001
Moonless Night	0.0001
Overcast Night	0.00001
Gas station canopies	25–30
Typical neighborhood streetlight and parking garage	1.0–5.0

Some of the design elements for light control and reduced spill lighting include mounting height and steep aiming angles, various lighting modes, visors and shielding, reflective housing around the luminaires, number of luminaires, and appropriate light levels. Higher poles could increase off-site glare, and shorter poles could increase off-site spill light and detrimentally affect lighting levels and performance. The proposed lighting poles would be designed to incorporate all these elements, and each element can be arranged individually to control and minimize any potential spill lighting impacts. Each light assembly would be adjusted, and additional shields would be installed as necessary to ensure that spill light levels at the adjacent uses are minimized. The current light technology can aim the lights only to the intended area so that the spill light levels beyond approximately 50 feet of the intended area are less than 0.2 fc. The joint-use space would be provided at the northeast corner of 14th Street and Howard Avenue, and there are no adjacent sensitive uses that border the joint-use space to be lighted with nighttime lighting. The closest residential unit would be approximately 200 feet away on Park Avenue. There are also streetlights and Lincoln Park community center between the lighted joint-use fields and the residences. Therefore, considering the lack of sensitive receptors around the joint-use space, it is not anticipated that the nighttime lighting of the joint-use space would result in substantial light and glare impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

8.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

- a) **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

No Impact. The proposed project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural uses. There is no agricultural or farm use on or adjacent to the project site; therefore, no project-related farmland conversion would occur. The area is developed and is not mapped as important farmland on the California Important Farmland Finder. The project site is mapped as Urban and Built-up Land (DLRP 2016). No impact would occur.

- b) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?**

No Impact. The project would not conflict with agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract. The zoning on the project site is R-1-7000 (Single-Family Residential), R-3-1500 (Multifamily Residential), PF (Public Facilities), CR (Commercial Retail), and CF (Commercial General) (City of Riverside 2007). The project site is not zoned for agriculture use, and project development would not conflict with such zoning. Williamson Act contracts restrict the use of privately owned land to agriculture and compatible open-space uses under contract with local governments; in exchange, the land is taxed based on actual use rather than potential market value. There is no Williamson Act contract in effect on the project site (City of Riverside 2012). No impact would occur.

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

No Impact. Project development would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland production. Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) defines forest land as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." Public Resources Code Section 4526 defines timberland as "land....which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees.” The project site is made up of developed urban uses and vacant lots, and is not zoned for forest land or timberland use. No impact would occur.

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

No Impact. Construction of the project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land. No vegetation on-site is cultivated for forest resources. Vegetation is limited to ornamental trees, shrubs, and turf. No forest land would be affected by the project. No impact would occur.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. There is no mapped important farmland or forest land on and near the project site, and project development would not indirectly cause conversion of such land to nonagricultural or non-forest use. No impact would occur.

8.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant Impact. Special-status species include those listed as endangered or threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act or California Endangered Species Act; species otherwise given certain designations by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife; and plant species listed as rare by the California Native Plant Society. The project site is in the Riverside East Quad of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), and the Riverside East Quad includes special-status animals and plant species (CDFW 2021). However, the project site is developed with various urban uses, such as a high school, single- and multifamily residential, institutional, and industrial uses; and the vacant lots have been cleared and grubbed over the years. Vegetation on-site is limited to ornamental trees and shrubs, turf, and potted plants. Considering the disturbed nature of the project site in the surrounding highly urbanized context, the project site does not have capacity to support any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species. According to the Open Space and Conservation Element, Figure OS-5, *Habitat Areas and Vegetation Communities*, of the City’s General Plan, the project site is within the residential/urban/exotic areas of the City (City of Riverside 2012). Therefore, less than significant impacts to special-status species would occur and no mitigation measures are required. There is no identified native habitat and no suitable habitat for threatened, endangered, or rare species on the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

No Impact. Sensitive natural communities are natural communities that are known to provide habitat for sensitive animal or plant species. Riparian habitats occur along the banks of rivers and streams. No locally designated natural communities or riparian habitats exist on or near the project site. The City of Riverside, including the project site, is within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). However, the project site is not part of criteria cells, public/quasi-public conserved lands, or MSHCP conserved lands. According to the Open Space and Conservation Element, Figure OS-5, *Habitat Areas and Vegetation Communities*, of the City's General Plan, the project site is within the residential/urban/exotic areas of the City (City of Riverside 2012). The project site and its surrounding area are highly urbanized and there are no riparian or other sensitive natural communities on or near the project site. No impact is anticipated.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

No Impact. There are no protected wetlands on the project site. The nearest area mapped on the National Wetlands Inventory is the channelized drainage about 470 feet to the west that is identified as riverine habitat (USFWS 2018). The project site does not drain to this channel and would not be impacted by project implementation. The project would be confined to the project site and would not impact any off-site protected wetland areas. No impact would occur.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Wildlife movement corridors facilitate movement of species between large patches of natural habitat. As shown in Figure 4-1, *Aerial Photograph*, the project site is in a highly disturbed and urbanized area. There is no natural habitat, wildlife open space, or vegetation near the project site that may provide connection for wildlife population exchange and movement (City of Riverside 2012).

However, there are ornamental trees and vegetation of various species, sizes, and maturity throughout the project site and may provide nesting sites for resident or migratory birds. The number of trees to be removed as part of the proposed project would depend on the final design of the project, and for the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that all trees would be removed. When removing trees or vegetation, in compliance with California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, 3513, and 3800, the proposed project is required to avoid the incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings or nest abandonment. Therefore, if removal of the vegetation occurs during nesting season (typically between February 1 and September 1), the District is required to conduct preconstruction nesting bird surveys in accordance with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife requirements prior to removal of the trees. Compliance with the existing regulation would ensure that the proposed project does not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. Impacts would not be significant.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) governs the taking, killing, possession, transportation, and importation of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests (US Code, Title 16, Sections 703–712). It prohibits the take, possession, import, export, transport, sale, purchase, barter, or offering of these activities, except under a valid permit or as permitted in the implementing regulations. The US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) administers permits to take migratory birds in accordance with the MBTA. In December 2017, the Department of the Interior issued a memorandum concluding that “consistent with the text, history, and purpose of the MBTA, [the statute’s prohibitions on take apply] only to affirmative actions that have as their purpose the taking or killing of migratory birds, their nests, or their eggs” (DOI 2017). Therefore, take of a migratory bird or its active nest (i.e., with eggs or young) that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, a lawful activity does not violate the MBTA. To provide guidance in implementing and enforcing this new direction, the USFWS issued a memorandum in April 2018 to clarify what does and does not constitute prohibited take (USFWS 2018).

Compliance with the existing California Department of Fish and Wildlife regulations would ensure that impacts to migratory birds are less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site contains ornamental trees of various species, sizes, and maturity. The City of Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 13.06, Vegetation Maintenance, provides regulations protecting trees adjacent to the public streets that may affect the safety of the street right-of-way and Chapter 13.25, Tree and Shrub Supervision, regulates trees on public streets, including planting and removal of trees (City of Riverside 2019). The District is required to comply with the Municipal Code Chapters 13.06 and 13.25. The required compliance would ensure that the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. The City of Riverside, including the project site, is within the Western Riverside County MSHCP. However, the project site is not within the MSHCP conservation areas or criteria cells (RCA 2022; City of Riverside 2012). Additionally, the project site is not within the Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan area or any other habitat conservation plan area (Riverside 2012). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impact would occur.

8.4 ENERGY

Would the project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less than Significant Impact.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Short-Term Construction

Construction of the proposed project would create temporary increased demands for electricity and vehicle fuels compared to existing conditions.

Electrical Energy

Electricity use during construction of the proposed project would vary during different phases of construction. The majority of the construction equipment would be gas- or diesel-powered, and electricity would not be used to power most of the construction equipment. Later construction phases could result in the use of electricity-powered equipment for interior construction and architectural coatings. However, it is anticipated that the majority of electric-powered construction equipment would be hand tools (e.g., power drills, table saws) and lighting, which would result in minimal electricity usage during construction activities. Therefore, project-related construction activities would not result in wasteful or unnecessary electricity demands. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Natural Gas Energy

It is not anticipated that construction equipment used for the proposed project would be powered by natural gas, and no natural gas demand is anticipated during construction. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Transportation Energy

Transportation energy use depends on the type and number of trips, vehicle miles traveled, fuel efficiency of vehicles, and travel mode. Transportation energy use during construction would come from the transport and use of construction equipment, delivery vehicles and haul trucks, and construction employee vehicles that would use diesel fuel and/or gasoline. It is anticipated that the majority of off-road construction equipment, such as those used during site preparation and grading, would be gas or diesel powered.

However, to limit wasteful and unnecessary energy consumption, the construction contractors are anticipated to minimize nonessential idling of construction equipment during construction, in accordance with Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2449. In addition, construction trips would not result in unnecessary use of energy since the project site is served by a major regional freeway system (State Route [SR-] 91) that provides the most direct routes from various areas of the region. Furthermore, electrical energy would be supplied by Riverside Public Utilities and available for use during construction from existing power lines and connections, precluding the use of less-efficient generators. Moreover, all construction equipment would cease operating upon completion of project construction. Thus, energy use during construction of the proposed project would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary. Impacts would be less than significant.

Long-Term Operation

The project site is already developed with a high school, residences, and some commercial uses that all consume electrical and natural gas energy. The proposed school will also consume electricity and natural gas for various purposes, including heating, cooling, and ventilation of buildings; water heating; operation of electrical systems;

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

lighting; use of on-site equipment and appliances, etc. Riverside Public Utilities and the Southern California Gas Company provide electric and natural gas service, respectively, to the City of Riverside. Table 8-2, *Electricity and Natural Gas Consumption*, shows the estimated annual natural gas and electricity usage for the proposed development under Option 3 as well as the additional lighting for the fields under Option 2. Total electricity and natural gas usage are based on the CalEEMod, Version 2020.4, default electricity and natural gas usage rates.

Table 8-2 Electricity and Natural Gas Consumption

Land Use	Electricity (kWh/year) ¹
Proposed Project Conditions	
Elementary School	428,654
High School	257,802
Parking Lot	18,130
Lighting ²	163,958
Total	868,544
Existing Electricity Consumption	769,122
Net Change from Existing Conditions	99,422
Natural Gas (kBTU/year)¹	
Proposed Project Conditions	
Elementary School	531,385
High School	296,734
Total	828,119
Existing Natural Gas Consumption	1,279,202
Net Change from Existing Conditions	-451,083

Source: CalEEMod Version 2020.4.

¹ Existing conditions for energy uses historic rates based on CalEEMod defaults. For proposed project buildout conditions, the default electricity and natural gas rates in CalEEMod was adjusted to reflect 'blended' energy efficiency associated with the existing school buildings that would remain (using historic rates in CalEEMod) and new structures that would be constructed to achieve the 2019 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards (see Appendix B).

² Electricity consumption calculated off model with the assumptions of everyday use from 5-10 pm for the joint-use of school and community park under Option 2, see Appendix B for calculations.

As shown in Table 8-2, the proposed project would lead to a net increase in the electricity consumption by about 99,422 kilowatt-hours per year and net decrease for the natural gas consumption by 451,083 kilo-British Thermal Units per year. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the most current applicable Building Energy-Efficiency Standards, which are energy conservation standards for new residential and nonresidential buildings first adopted by the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (now the California Energy Commission [CEC]) in June 1977 (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 6). The standards are updated on a three-year cycle to incorporate new energy-efficiency technologies.¹ The 2019 Building Energy-Efficiency Standards, which were adopted on May 9, 2018, went into effect starting January 1, 2020. The 2019 standards focus on four key areas: (1) smart residential photovoltaic

¹ The California Energy Code, part 6 of the California Building Standards Code which is title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, also titled The Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

systems; (2) updated thermal envelope standards (preventing heat transfer from the interior to exterior and vice versa); (3) residential and nonresidential ventilation requirements; and (4) nonresidential lighting requirements (CEC 2018a). Under the 2019 standards, nonresidential buildings (which include school buildings), will be 30 percent more energy efficient compared to the 2016 standards (CEC 2018b).

On August 11, 2021, the CEC adopted the 2022 Building Energy-Efficiency Standards, which were approved by the California Building Standards Commission in December 2021 (CEC 2019). The 2022 standards will become effective and replace the existing 2019 standards on January 1, 2023. The new standards include prescriptive photovoltaic system and battery requirements for high-rise, multifamily buildings (i.e., more than three stories) and noncommercial buildings, such as hotels, offices, medical offices, restaurants, retail stores, schools, warehouses, theaters, and convention centers. Compliance with the latest applicable Building Energy-Efficiency Standards would result in the new buildings being more energy efficient than the existing buildings.

A typical new school project would consume transportation energy during operations from the use of motor vehicles associated with students, staff, and visitors to the campus. The efficiency of these motor vehicles is unknown, such as the average miles per gallon. Estimates of transportation energy use are based on the overall vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and its associated transportation energy use. As shown in Table 8-3, *Project Annual Operation-Related Fuel Usage*, the annual VMT for the proposed project is estimated to be a net increase of 3,360,349 miles per year.

Table 8-3 Project Annual Operation-Related Fuel Usage

	Gasoline		Diesel		CNG		Electricity	
	Annual VMT	Annual Gallons	Annual VMT	Annual Gallons	Annual VMT	Annual Gallons	Annual VMT	Annual kWh
Year 2022	2,645,339	101,953	66,514	6,667	1,323	247	69,314	24,861
Proposed Project	6,005,688	199,867	59,133	5,238	688	102	410,242	149,338
Net Change from Existing Conditions	3,360,349	97,914	-7,381	-1,429	-635	-146	340,928	124,477

Source: CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0- EMFAC2021 v. 1.0.2.

While there would be an increase in VMT, implementation of the proposed project would provide new educational facilities for the existing and future students in the Eastside Neighborhood of the District, which may reduce VMT by providing a closer option for future students. As stated in Chapter 5.7, *Transportation*, the proposed project would include a bus loading/unloading zone and bike racks to promote alternative modes of transportation. In addition, development of the proposed project would serve the local Eastside Neighborhood and reduce students being bused outside of the area. Thus, the proposed project would contribute to minimize VMT and transportation-related fuel usage and help accommodate any general student growth in the local region. Furthermore, local-serving K-12 schools are screened from further VMT analysis under the City of Riverside Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines and are presumed to result in a less than significant VMT impact. Therefore, overall, the proposed project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy during construction activities or long-term operation. Impacts would be less than significant.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

No Impact. The state's electricity grid is transitioning to renewable energy under California's Renewable Energy Program. Renewable sources of electricity include wind, small hydropower, solar, geothermal, biomass, and biogas. Electricity production from renewable sources is generally considered carbon neutral. Executive Order S-14-08, signed in November 2008, expanded the state's renewable portfolios standard (RPS) to 33 percent renewable power by 2020. This standard was adopted by the legislature in 2011 (SB X1-2). Senate Bill 350 (de Leon) was signed into law September 2015 and establishes tiered increases to the RPS—40 percent by 2024, 45 percent by 2027, and 50 percent by 2030. Senate Bill 350 also set a new goal to double the energy-efficiency savings in electricity and natural gas through energy-efficiency and conservation measures. On September 10, 2018, Senate Bill 100 (SB 100) was signed and raised California's RPS requirements to 60 percent by 2030, with interim targets, and 100 percent by 2045. The bill also established a state policy that eligible renewable energy resources and zero-carbon resources supply 100 percent of all retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers and 100 percent of electricity procured to serve all state agencies by December 31, 2045. Under SB 100, the state cannot increase carbon emissions elsewhere in the western grid or allow resource shuffling to achieve the 100 percent carbon-free electricity target.

The statewide RPS goal is not directly applicable to individual development projects, but to utilities and energy providers such as Riverside Public Utilities, which is the utility that would provide all electricity needs for the proposed project. Compliance of the Riverside Public Utilities in meeting the RPS goals would ensure the state meets its objective in transitioning to renewable energy. However, overall, the new classroom buildings would comply with the Building Energy Efficiency Standards and California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 11), and would be significantly more energy efficient than the existing buildings. Furthermore, the project would be reviewed by DSA for compliance with design and construction and energy compliance. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and no impacts would occur.

8.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The analysis in this section is based in part on the following technical studies:

- *Geologic and Environmental Hazards Assessment, Eastside School, PlaceWorks, September 2019 (Appendix I to the Draft EIR)*

Would the project:

- a) **Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**
 - i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other**

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?

Less than Significant Impact. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazards of surface faulting and fault rupture on habitable buildings. Fault rupture generally occurs within 50 feet of an active fault line and is limited to the immediate area of the fault. Active earthquake faults are faults where surface rupture has occurred within the last 11,000 years. The project site is not within or immediately adjacent to (i.e., within a few hundred feet) of a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards. The nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone is the San Jacinto Fault approximately 7.1 miles northeast of the project site (PlaceWorks 2019). Fault rupture impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. Southern California is a seismically active region and ground shaking occurs many miles from an earthquake epicenter. The potential severity of ground shaking depends on many factors, including the distance from the originating fault, the earthquake magnitude, and the nature of the earth materials beneath a given site. There are several known faults in the Riverside region. The closest historically active surface fault is the San Jacinto Fault approximately 7.1 miles northeast of the project site (PlaceWorks 2019). Because of the proximity to known faults and because the entire southern California region is considered seismically active, there is a potential for people and structures to experience strong ground shaking in the future from local and regional faults.

However, the new school buildings are required to be designed in accordance with the California Building Code (CBC), the California Geological Survey's "Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California," and "Checklist for the Review of Geologic/Seismic Reports for California Schools, Hospitals, and Essential Services Buildings" to ensure that impacts from ground shaking are minimized (CGS 2008, 2013). Additionally, a geotechnical investigation will be prepared as required by the CBC, and recommendations contained therein will be implemented for site operation and construction to minimize hazards from seismic ground shaking. The proposed project requires review and approval from the Division of the State Architect (DSA) for compliance with design and construction and accessibility standards and codes, including seismic requirements. Seismic ground shaking impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. Liquefaction refers to loose, saturated sand or gravel deposits that lose their load-supporting capability when subjected to intense shaking. Liquefaction potential varies based on three main contributing factors: (1) cohesionless, granular soils having relatively low densities (usually of Holocene age);² (2) shallow groundwater (generally less than 50 feet); and (3) moderate to high seismic ground shaking. Based on the City of Riverside General Plan, Public Safety Element, Figure PS-2, Liquefaction Zone, the project site is not in an area of potential liquefaction. Therefore, the proposed

² The Holocene epoch began 12,000 to 11,500 years ago.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

project would not expose people to adverse effects associated with liquefaction. Furthermore, the proposed project would be developed in compliance with the CBC and DSA standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. Landslides are a type of erosion in which masses of earth and rock move downslope as a single unit. Susceptibility of slopes to landslides and lurching (earth movement at right angles to a cliff or steep slope during ground shaking) depend on several factors, which are usually present in combination—steep slopes, condition of rock and soil materials, the presence of water, formational contacts, geologic shear zones, and seismic activity. The project site and its adjoining properties are relatively flat and exhibit no substantial elevation changes or unusual geographic features. The site is not within or immediately adjacent to a landslide zone (PlaceWorks 2019). Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people to adverse effects associated with landslides. No impact would occur.

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

Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction Phase

Erosion is a normal and inevitable geologic process whereby earthen materials are loosened, worn away, decomposed, or dissolved, and moved from one place to another. Precipitation, running water, waves, and wind are all agents of erosion. Ordinarily, erosion proceeds imperceptibly, but when the natural equilibrium of the environment is changed, the rate of erosion can be greatly accelerated. This can create aesthetic as well as engineering problems on undeveloped sites. Accelerated erosion in an urban area can cause damage by undermining structures; blocking storm drains; and depositing silt, sand, or mud on roads and in tunnels. Eroded materials can eventually be deposited in local waters, where the carried silt remains suspended in the water for some time, constituting a pollutant and altering the normal balance of plant and animal life.

Project-related construction activities would expose soil through excavation, grading, and trenching, and thus could cause erosion during heavy winds or rainstorms. Construction projects of one acre or more are regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ) issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The District would obtain coverage by preparing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), estimating sediment risk from construction activities to receiving waters, and specifying best management practices (BMPs) that would be incorporated into the construction plan to minimize stormwater pollution. Categories of BMPs used in SWPPPs are described in Table 8-4, *Construction BMPs*. The proposed project would be subject to the Statewide Construction General Permit (CGP) and implementation of BMPs specified in the SWPPP. Construction-phase soil erosion impacts would be less than significant.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Table 8-4 Construction BMPs

Category	Purpose	Examples
Erosion Controls and Wind Erosion Controls	Cover and/or bind soil surface, to prevent soil particles from being detached and transported by water or wind.	Mulch, geotextiles, mats, hydroseeding, earth dikes, swales.
Sediment Controls	Filter out soil particles that have been detached and transported in water.	Barriers such as straw bales, sandbags, fiber rolls, and gravel bag berms; desilting basin; cleaning measures such as street sweeping.
Tracking Controls	Minimize the tracking of soil off-site by vehicles.	Stabilized construction roadways and construction entrances/exits; entrance/outlet tire wash.
Non-stormwater Management Controls	Prohibit discharge of materials other than stormwater, such as discharges from the cleaning, maintenance, and fueling of vehicles and equipment. Conduct various construction operations, including paving, grinding, and concrete curing and finishing, in ways that minimize non-stormwater discharges and contamination of any such discharges.	BMPs specifying methods for: paving and grinding operations; cleaning, fueling, and maintenance of vehicles and equipment; concrete curing; concrete finishing.
Waste Management and Controls (i.e., good housekeeping practices)	Management of materials and wastes to avoid contamination of stormwater.	Spill prevention and control, stockpile management, and management of solid wastes and hazardous wastes.

Source: California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA), California Construction Best Management Practices Handbook, January 2015.

Operational Phase

After completion of the project, ground surfaces would be either hardscape or maintained landscaping, and no large areas of exposed soil would be left to erode. The new buildings and other campus improvements would not cause an increase in erosion of soils off-campus. Operational phase soil erosion impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Hazards arising from liquefaction and landslides would be less than significant, as discussed previously in Sections 8.5(a)(iii) and a(iv).

Lateral spreading. Lateral spreading is the downslope movement of surface sediment due to liquefaction in a subsurface layer. The campus is not prone to lateral spreading because near-surface site sediments are not prone to liquefaction, as discussed in Section 8.5(a)(iii).

Subsidence. The major cause of ground subsidence is the withdrawal of groundwater. The project site is not identified as within areas of subsidence due to groundwater pumping, oil extraction, or peat loss (USGS 2022). The proposed project also would not result in the withdrawal of additional groundwater. Project implementation would not pose substantial hazards to people or structures due to ground subsidence and impacts would be less than significant.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Collapsible Soils. Collapsible soils are soils that compact and collapse after saturation. Any nonengineered fills encountered during grading would be removed and replaced with engineered fill that meets the DSA requirements. As part of the DSA review process, the project design and development will incorporate all recommended measures related to engineered fill placement and foundation in the engineering-level geotechnical report to ensure seismic safety, as required by existing regulations. The required compliance with CBC and DSA standards and recommendations of the geotechnical investigation would minimize hazards from collapsible soils, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Expansive soils possess clay particles that react to moisture changes by shrinking when dry or swelling when wet. These soils have the potential to crack building foundations and, in some cases, structurally distress the buildings themselves. Minor-to-severe damage to overlying structures is possible. Based on high shrink/swell soil mapping in the City of Riverside's General Plan, the site is not within an expansive soil zone (PlaceWorks 2019). Therefore, the project will not expose people to adverse effects associated with expansive soils, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The existing campus does not use septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impact would occur.

8.6 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The analysis in this section is based in part on the following technical studies:

- Conceptual Hydrology Study, Eastside Neighborhood School, Riverside Unified School District, PlaceWorks. June 2022. (Appendix J to this Draft EIR)
- *Geologic and Environmental Hazards Assessment, Eastside School Modernization*, PlaceWorks, September 2019 (see Appendix I to this Draft EIR)

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the project discharges water that does not meet the quality standards of agencies that regulate surface water quality and water discharge into stormwater drainage systems. A significant impact would also occur if the project does not comply with surface water quality regulations as governed by the SWRCB.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

New construction projects can result in two types of water quality impacts: (1) short-term impacts from discharge of soil through erosion, sediments, and other pollutants during construction and (2) long-term impacts from impervious surfaces (buildings, roads, parking lots, and walkways) that prevent water from being absorbed into the ground, thereby increasing the pollutants in stormwater runoff. Impervious surfaces can increase the concentration of pollutants in stormwater runoff, such as oil, fertilizers, pesticides, trash, soil, and animal waste. Runoff from short-term construction and long-term operation can flow directly into lakes, local streams, channels, and storm drains and eventually be released untreated into the ocean.

The proposed project would be constructed in an area that is already developed and producing nonpoint-source pollutants by various land uses.³

Construction Phase

Clearing, grading, excavation, and construction activities associated with the proposed project may impact water quality through soil erosion and increasing the amount of silt and debris carried in runoff. Additionally, the use of construction materials such as fuels, solvents, and paints may present a risk to surface water quality. Finally, the refueling and parking of construction vehicles and other equipment on-site during construction may result in oil, grease, or related pollutant leaks and spills that may discharge into the storm drain system.

To minimize these potential impacts, the proposed project would be required to comply with the NPDES CGP as well as prepare a SWPPP that requires the incorporation of BMPs to control sedimentation, erosion, and hazardous materials contamination of runoff during construction. The SWRCB mandates that projects that disturb one or more acres of land must obtain coverage under the Statewide CGP. The CGP also requires that prior to the start of construction activities, the project applicant must file permit registration documents (PRDs) with the SWRCB, which includes a Notice of Intent, risk assessment, site map, annual fee, signed certification statement, SWPPP, and post-construction water balance calculations. The construction contractor is required to maintain a copy of the SWPPP on-site at all times and implement all construction BMPs identified in the SWPPP during construction activities. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant is required to provide proof of filing of the PRDs with the SWRCB, which include preparation of SWPPP.

The SWPPP must describe construction BMPs that address pollutant source reduction and provide measures/controls to mitigate potential pollutant sources. These include, but are not limited to:

- Erosion controls (e.g., earth dikes and swales, mulching, slope drains, compost blankets)
- Sediment controls (e.g., silt fence, sediment trap, sandbag, or straw bale barriers)
- Tracking controls (e.g., stabilized construction entrance/exit, tire wash)

³ **Point-source pollution:** The Environmental Protection Agency defines point-source pollution as any single identifiable source of pollution from which pollutants are discharged, such as a pipe, ditch, ship, or factory smokestack. Factories and sewage treatment plants are two common types of point sources.

Nonpoint-source pollution is caused by broadly distributed and disconnected sources of pollution, such as rain and snowmelt runoff, spills, leaks, and sediment erosion.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

- Non-stormwater management (e.g., dewatering practices, vehicle and equipment cleaning)
- Materials and waste management (e.g., material storage, hazardous waste management, soil management)
- Good housekeeping practices

Submittal of the PRDs and implementation of the SWPPP and its associated BMPs throughout the construction phase of the proposed project will address anticipated and expected pollutants of concern due to construction activities. The proposed project would comply with all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements.

Operation Phase

Once the proposed project has been constructed, urban runoff could include a variety of contaminants that could impact water quality. Runoff from buildings and parking lots typically contain oils, grease, fuel, antifreeze, byproducts of combustion (such as lead, cadmium, nickel, and other metals), as well as fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, and other pollutants. Precipitation at the beginning of the rainy season may result in an initial stormwater runoff (first flush) with high pollutant concentrations.

The K-12 school districts in California, including the District, are not currently covered under the MS4 permit. Therefore, the District is currently not regulated under the County MS4 permit. However, the SWRCB is in the process of designating school districts and community colleges as non-traditional permittees in the next iteration of the Phase II MS4 permit. Therefore, in the interim, the District is required to comply with the post-construction performance standards under the SWRCB's General CGP. The performance standards specify runoff reduction requirements for all sites not covered by Phase I or Phase II MS4 permits to minimize and mitigate stormwater runoff impacts. During the design phase of the proposed project, the District is required to incorporate various site-design, source-control, and treatment-control BMPs into the proposed project in compliance with the requirements of SWRCB at the time of project construction. At this phase of the planning process, detailed design drawings have not yet been developed.

Site Design BMPs

Site design BMPs would be incorporated into the project's design to reduce the potential impacts on surface and groundwater quality. These may include, but are not limited to, maximizing pervious areas, minimizing directly connected impervious areas, use of on-site ponding areas (i.e., at-grade detention basins), constructing hardscape with permeable materials, and implementing hydrologically functional landscape design.

Site design BMPs and features that have been incorporated into the Master Plan for this campus include:

- Incorporate trees, open space, and landscaping to mitigate urban heat island impacts.
- Include mostly native plants and drought-tolerant plants in landscaping plans.
- Use of effective irrigation systems to minimize water usage.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Source Control BMPs

Source control BMPs effectively minimize the potential for typical urban pollutants to contact stormwater, thereby limiting water quality impacts downstream. A variety of source control BMPs would be incorporated into the proposed project and implemented throughout the operation of the campus, including the following:

- Educational materials related to urban runoff provided to all employees, students, and staff.
- Inspection and maintenance of site BMPs—catch basins, grate inlets, etc.
- Compliance with the City of Riverside Municipal Code and Uniform Fire Code.
- Provide storm drain stenciling or signage on all storm drain inlets and catch basins per City or County requirements, as applicable.
- Properly design and inspect on a regular basis all trash storage areas, loading docks, outdoor storage areas, and outdoor work areas.

Treatment Control BMPs

Treatment control BMPs (single or in combination) remove anticipated pollutants of concern from on-site runoff. They can range from natural treatment systems, such as vegetated swales, detention basins, and constructed wetlands, to proprietary control measures. The proposed project would be required to provide appropriate treatment control BMPs to reduce peak flows and treat stormwater prior to discharge into the City's storm drain system.

Furthermore, as part of the statewide mandate to reduce trash in receiving waters, the District would adhere to the requirements of the SWRCB Trash Amendments. The requirements include the installation and maintenance of full-capture trash screening devices at curb inlets, grate inlets, and catch basin inlets. The trash screening devices must be certified by the SWRCB. With the implementation of the BMP features described previously, as well as compliance with State, County, and local regulations and code requirements, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on surface or groundwater quality during the operational phase.

The proposed project would not discharge increased stormwater runoff or pollutants to the drainage system and would not substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Operational phase impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Riverside Public Utilities (RPU) supplies water to the project site and the surrounding community. RPU has facilities to extract groundwater from five groundwater basins: Bunker Hill, Rialto-Colton, Riverside North, Riverside South, and Arlington Basins. The project site is in the Riverside South Basin (RPU 2021). RPU's primary source of supply is local groundwater through its 53 active

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

wells (46 producing potable water and 7 producing non-potable water). RPU has 20 inactive wells that are being used as monitoring wells and 13 other monitoring wells, for a total of 33 dedicated monitoring wells (RPU 2021). The nearest groundwater well is a groundwater quality monitoring well (Station Number 02S05W23Q001S) approximately 750 feet to the south of the project site. However, the last sample date is in 1981 from this well and it no longer provides groundwater quality data (DWR 2022). The second nearest groundwater well is approximately 2,180 feet east of the project site (State Well Number 02S05W25F001S). The last groundwater was encountered at a depth of approximately 151 feet below ground surface (bgs) in October 2021 and groundwater levels at this well are typically at depths greater than 140 feet bgs (DWR 2022). The project site is developed with various urban uses and is approximately 60 percent impervious under all three options. The project site is not a substantial ground recharge area. With implementation of the proposed project, the impervious areas within the project site would remain around 60 percent for all three options. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in a decrease in groundwater recharge to the Riverside South Groundwater Basin.

The proposed project would result in an increase in water demand but would not involve the extraction or installation of any groundwater wells on the property.

Based on RPU's 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), future water demand was calculated based on a percentage growth rate to demands across the RPU's service area using the Department of Water Resources (DWR) Population Tool (RPU 2021). Because the proposed project would serve the existing Eastside Neighborhood and would not induce future growth, the proposed project is not anticipated to require additional groundwater demand that would require extraction of additional groundwater from its basin. The 2020 UWMP identified sufficient water supplies to meet demands in its service area in normal, single-dry year, and multiple-dry-year conditions through 2045. Furthermore, groundwater production from the Riverside South Basin, among other groundwater basins, is affected by the Western-San Bernardino Judgement, which establishes specific amounts of water that can be extracted from the Riverside South Basin, and also requires the basin to be replenished if extractions for use in Riverside County in aggregate exceed certain specific amounts, and if water levels are lower than certain specific water-level elevations in specified wells (RPU 2021). Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

Construction and operation of an elementary school would not lower the groundwater table or deplete groundwater supplies. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i) Result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Construction Phase

The project site is partially developed, and during construction, erosion and siltation from the disturbed areas may occur. Construction-related activities related to excavation, grading, and trenching would expose soils to rainfall/runoff and wind, which are primarily responsible for erosion. Unless adequate erosion controls are installed and maintained during construction, sediment may enter storm drains. However, as previously stated in Section 8.6(a), the project would be required to submit PRDs and a SWPPP to the SWRCB for approval prior to the commencement of construction activities. The SWPPP would describe the BMPs to be implemented during the project's construction activities, including:

- Minimize disturbed areas of the site.
- Preserve existing vegetation to the maximum extent practicable.
- Revegetate exposed areas as quickly as possible.
- Install on-site sediment basins to prevent off-site migration of erodible materials, as needed.
- Install velocity dissipation devices at outlets of sediment basins.
- Implement dust control measures, such as silt fences and regular watering of areas.
- Stabilize construction entrances/exits.
- Install storm drain inlet protection measures.
- Install sediment control measures along the site, such as silt fences or gravel bag barriers.

The required compliance with the CGP and implementation of applicable BMPs per the SWPPP would ensure that construction-related erosion impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. Additionally, South Coast Air Quality Management District has regulations that require control of windblown soil. Impacts would be less than significant.

Operation Phase

Upon project completion, no areas of exposed soil would be left to erode, and the proposed project would contain a number of features to reduce the impact of erosion and siltation. As required under the post-construction performance standards of the SWRCB's CGP, the proposed project will incorporate various site design, source control, and treatment control BMPs for the operational phase, as discussed in Section 8.6(a). Implementation of the required operational phase BMPs would ensure that no areas of exposed soil would be left to erode following project completion, and erosion and siltation impacts would be less than significant.

ii) **Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Conceptual Hydrology Study prepared for the proposed project, the project under Option 3 would result in the most increase in stormwater runoff among the three options. Table 8-5, *Existing and Post-development Pervious/Impervious Areas*, summarizes the existing and proposed impervious and pervious areas for all three options. As shown in this table, the proposed project would impact approximately 8.62 acres under Options 1 and 3, and 7.07 acres under Option 2. Under

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Options 1 and 2, the total pervious surface areas would slightly increase; therefore, would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff. Additionally, the proposed project would provide low-impact development (LID) BMPs to further reduce runoff rate and amount of surface runoff. Under Option 3, the pervious areas decrease by 0.72 acres (8.4 percent) from 3.44 to 2.72 acres.

Table 8-5 Existing and Post-development Pervious/Impervious Areas

Options	Pervious Area		Impervious Area		Total Area
	Area	Percentage	Area	Percentage	
Options 1 and 3 – Existing	3.44 acres	40%	5.18 acres	60%	8.62 acres
Option 1 – Post Development	3.46 acres	40%	5.16 acres	60%	8.62 acres
Option 1 – Change	0.02 acre	0.23%	(-0.02)	(-0.23%)	--
Option 3 – Post Development	2.72 acres	32%	5.90 acres	68%	8.62 acres
Option 3 – Change	(-0.72 acre)	(-8.4%)	0.72	8.4%	--
Option 2 – Existing	3.57 acres	50%	3.50 acres	50%	7.07 acres
Option 2 – Post Development	3.33 acres	47%	3.74 acres	53%	7.07 acres
Option 2 – Change	(-0.24 acres)	(-3%)	0.24 acres	3%	--

Source: PlaceWorks, 2022.

Table 8-6, *Existing and Post-development Runoff Summary*, summarizes the 100-year and 10-year storm events runoff peak flow change resulting from the pervious/impervious area changes shown in Table 8-5. As shown, only Option 3 would result in increased peak flow of 0.90 cubic feet per second (cfs) in a 100-year storm event, and 0.75 cfs in a 10-year storm event. Because the increase is less than 1 cfs for both storm events, the proposed project under Option 3 is not anticipated to result in flooding on- or off-site. Furthermore, the District is required to design and size stormwater BMPs, such as bioretention facilities, at-grade detention basins, hardscape with permeable materials, and/or hydrologically functional landscape design to minimize stormwater impact. Therefore, under all three options, the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Table 8-6 Existing and Post-development Runoff Summary

Storm Event	Site Configuration Options	Existing Peak Flow (cfs)	Post-Development Peak Flow (cfs)	Difference (cfs)
100-year	Option 1	14.88	13.55	- 1.33
	Option 2	13.15	12.98	- 0.17
	Option 3	14.88	15.78	+ 0.90
10-year	Option 1	10.05	9.26	- 0.79
	Option 2	9.20	9.07	- 0.13
	Option 3	10.05	10.8	+ 0.75

Source: PlaceWorks, 2022.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant Impact. As stated in the previous impact discussion in Section 8.6(c)(ii), an increase in impervious surfaces with the development of the proposed project under Option 3 could result in increases in stormwater runoff. The other two options would not increase the impervious surfaces and would not create or contribute runoff water that could exceed the existing stormwater drainage system or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Under all three options, the proposed project is required to be designed incorporating LID BMPs that would reduce peak flow and treat stormwater prior to discharging to the City's existing drainage system. All treatment BMPs would be designed in compliance with the Riverside County Design Handbook for Low Impact Development Best Management Practices (Riverside County 2011). California Government Code Section 53097 requires school districts to comply with city or county ordinances regulating drainage improvements and conditions as they relate to design and construction of on-site improvements that affect drainage. The hydrology/hydraulic study would include calculations to show that post-development flow rates do not substantially differ from pre-development flow rates and there are no hydromodification impacts. The Conceptual Hydrology Study (Appendix J to the Draft EIR) has been prepared based on the conceptual design of the three options and preliminary design capture volumes (DCV) are provided for an 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event based on the County's Design Handbook for Low Impact Development Best Management Practices. While these are conceptual only, these DCV calculations would be used to design and size stormwater BMPs during the design phase once the final site plan option has been selected. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems. It should also be noted that the project site is not in an area susceptible to hydromodification impacts (Riverside County Flood 2017). Therefore, post-development runoff rates do not have to match pre-development runoff rates (Santa Ana RWQCB 2012).

Furthermore, the proposed project, under all three options, would not create substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. During the construction phase, the District would be required to prepare a SWPPP that includes erosion controls, thus limiting the discharge of pollutants from the site. During operation, the proposed project would implement LID and BMP measures that minimize the amount of stormwater runoff and associated pollutants.

With implementation of City and County regulatory requirements, the project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of stormwater runoff in a manner that would cause flooding. Therefore, stormwater runoff would not exceed the capacity of existing or planning storm drain facilities.

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Flood hazard zones are areas subject to flood hazards that are identified on an official Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Flooding can be the result of intense rainfall or inadequate drainage. Areas within a 100-year floodplain have a 1 percent probability of flooding in a given year. According to the most recent FIRM that covers the project site (FIRM No. 06065C0726G dated August 27, 2008), the project site is designated

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

flood hazard zone X, area of minimal flood hazard, not within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain (FEMA 2008; PlaceWorks 2019). The California Office of Emergency Services' (OES) Dam Inundation Map locates the southwestern corner of lot C2 at the southwest corner of the project site as within the inundation area of Box Springs Dam (OES 2016). Box Springs Dam is about 2.4 miles from the project site. The dam inundation area is shown in the Geologic and Environmental Hazard Assessment, Figure 5, *Box Spring Dam Inundation Area*, included as Appendix I to the Draft EIR. However, the small area would be developed as hardcourts and walkways, and no habitable structures would be developed. This area can be easily evaluated to other parts of the site that are outside of the inundation area. In addition, the Box Springs Dam is a flood-control feature rather than a dam for a standing reservoir, and as a result of that designation, it rarely holds back standing water (PlaceWorks 2019). Therefore, the impact from dam inundation is less than significant. The proposed project would not impede or redirect flood flows.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. As discussed in Section 8.6(c)(iv), the proposed project would not be subject to flooding related to a 100-year flood zones mapped by FEMA nor a dam inundation zone. A seiche is an oscillating surface wave in a restricted or enclosed body of water, generated by ground motion, usually during an earthquake. There is no large water body in the vicinity of the project site that would pose a flood hazard to the school due to a seiche. The most likely areas that could be subject to seiche in the City of Riverside are areas near Lake Mathews approximately 9 miles south of the project site and Lake Evans, approximately 1.6 miles northwest of the project site. Considering the distance and surrounding land uses between the project site and the lakes, there is no potential for seiche impact from Lake Mathews nor Lake Evans.

Tsunamis are a type of earthquake-induced flooding produced by large-scale sudden disturbances of the sea floor. Tsunami waves interact with the shallow sea floor when approaching a landmass, resulting in an increase in wave height and a destructive wave surge into low-lying coastal areas. The project site is approximately 39 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, the campus is outside the tsunami hazard zone and would not be affected by a tsunami.

The project would not release pollutants as the result of floods, tsunami, or seiche. No impact would occur.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan. The project construction would be subject to the Statewide CGP and implementation of BMPs specified in the SWPPP. This would minimize the potential for erosion or siltation impacts to occur that could impact receiving waters.

As discussed in Section 8.6(b), the project site is within the Riverside South groundwater basin. However, the project site is not a substantial groundwater recharge area and implementation of the proposed project would not result in additional water demands that have not previously planned by the 2020 UWMP that would require extraction of additional groundwater from the Riverside South groundwater basin. Although the 2011 Riverside Groundwater Management Plan projected Riverside South to be over-drafted, the Western-San Bernardino

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Judgement requires the basin to be carefully monitored and replenished if extractions for use in Riverside County in aggregate exceed certain specific amounts, and if water levels are lower than certain specific water level elevations in specified wells (RPU 2021). The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

8.7 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

Less Than Significant Impact. The key factor with respect to this environmental factor is creating physical barriers that change the connectivity between areas of a community to the extent that persons are separated from other areas of the community. Connectivity is typically provided by roadways, pedestrian paths, and bicycle paths. Therefore, physical environmental impacts from dividing an established community could occur by construction of major highways or roadways or closing of roadways or bridges that provide connection within the community. Under all three options, Park Avenue (approximately 350 feet segment) between Thirteenth Street and Fourteenth Street would be vacated. Park Avenue is a north to south two-lane roadway with sidewalks on both sides. Under Option 2, additional closing of Thirteenth Street between Howard Avenue and Park Avenue would be required. However, vacating Park Avenue and 13th Street would not divide Eastside Neighborhood because the adjacent Howard Avenue and Victoria Avenue would continue to provide north to south connectivity within the community and 14th Street and 12th Street would continue to provide east to west connectivity within the community. 12th Street would remain open under all options, and the proposed project would not physically impact businesses along Park Avenue between 9th Street and 12th Street. The proposed school would serve the existing Eastside Neighborhood students who currently attend five surrounding elementary schools, of which, only two are within Eastside Neighborhood. Therefore, the proposed project would provide an elementary school closer to where students reside, creating opportunity to walk to school. The proposed project would not physically divide Eastside Neighborhood. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less than Significant Impact. The zoning for the project site is R-1-7000 (Single-Family Residential), R-3-1500 (Multifamily Residential), PF (Public Facilities), CR (Commercial Retail), and CG (Commercial General). General Plan land use designations for the project site are MDR (Medium-Density Residential), PF (Public Facilities/Institutional), P (Public Park), and B-OP (Business-Office Park).

The District is a state agency and its own lead agency, and it is not subject to the City's local government planning and land use plans, policies, or regulations. Government Code Section 53094 allows the governing board of a school district, by a vote of two-thirds of its members, to render a city or county zoning ordinance inapplicable to a proposed use of property by the school district. The District plans to exempt itself from the

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

City zoning regulations, and consistency with the City's zoning designations would not apply to the proposed project.

The project site is within the Eastside Neighborhood Plan, and the proposed project would be consistent with the following objective and policy of the Eastside Neighborhood Plan by establishing a new school that students can walk to, rather than be driven to, thereby expanding educational opportunities and access to educational facilities.

- **Objective ENP 10:** Expand educational opportunities and access to educational facilities for the residents of the Eastside Neighborhood.
 - **Policy ENP 10.1.** Collaborate with Riverside Unified School District (RUSD) to establish new schools or increase capacity of existing schools.

The project site is within the planning boundaries of the City's Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities (AHSC) + Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) program, where the grants are offered by the California Strategic Growth Council to fund affordable housing, smart transit and walkable communities, urban greening, and solar and water/power efficiency project, among a wide range of activities. The main objective is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and establish healthier communities over time. The City of Riverside was awarded grant funding, which includes active transportation and mobility enhancements in the vicinity of the project site. The initial plan showed bike and pedestrian improvements that go through Park Avenue from 14th Street to University Avenue, which would conflict with the proposed project since all three options would require vacation of Park Avenue. However, after a collaborative effort between the City of Riverside staff and District staff, the City determined that the bike and pedestrian improvements would occur on Howard Avenue from 14th Street to 12th Street. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with the City's AHSC and TCC program. Additionally, the development of a neighborhood school in Eastside Neighborhood would allow students to walk to school and reduce VMT by placing the school closer to its service population.

SCAG Connect SoCal Consistency

The proposed project involves development of an elementary school that serves existing Eastside Neighborhood. The proposed project is not considered a project of regionwide significance pursuant to Section 15206 of the CEQA Guidelines, and the proposed project does not require a General Plan amendment. Therefore, the goals in the adopted 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS, Connect SoCal) are not applicable to the proposed project, and the proposed project is not anticipated to conflict with the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. Impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would not significantly impact the environment; therefore, the project would not conflict with regulations adopted for protecting the environment. The project will be DSA approved, and the District's DSA inspector would perform inspections to ensure the project meets state requirements for construction and safety. The proposed project would not conflict with existing plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. Impacts would be less than significant.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

8.8 MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- a) **Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The campus is mapped as Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-3) under the City of Riverside General Plan 2023 Open Space and Conservation Element. MRZ-3 is defined as an area that contains known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resources significance (City of Riverside 2012). Figure OS-1 (Mineral Resources) of the City's General Plan shows the location of mineral resource sites (feldspar and silica, limestone, and rock products) within the City's planning area and the project site is not identified as one of the sites with mineral resources. Additionally, there are no active mines on or near the project site (DMR 2022; CalGEM 2022). The proposed project does not involve extraction of mineral resources. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region, and impacts would be less than significant.

- 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?**

No Impact. As discussed in Section 8.8(a), the project site is not delineated on a local general plan or any other plan as having a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, development of the project would not cause a loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource. No impact would occur.

8.9 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

- a) **Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

No Impact. The proposed project involves development of a neighborhood school in an urban area with existing roads and other infrastructure. The proposed project would serve the existing students who are being bussed to seven surrounding District elementary schools. Five of those schools are outside of the Eastside Neighborhood. Development of a K-8 school is not a growth-inducing project that would induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area directly. The proposed project would be served by existing infrastructure and no extension of roads would be required. Impacts would not be significant.

- b) **Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in displacement of nine single-family dwelling units, one three-plex housing unit, and three commercial properties. The total number of housing units in the City of Riverside is 101,441 units in 2021, and single-family homes compose

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

the majority (68,583 units or 68 percent) of the City's housing stock (DOF 2021). The vacancy rate in the city in 2021 was 4.8 percent; therefore, approximately 4,869 units are available throughout the city (DOF 2021). According to home sale websites such as Redfin and Zillow, there are 298 homes for sale in the city boundary, of which, 22 are within the Eastside Neighborhood as of March 28, 2022 (Redfin 2022; Zillow 2022). Because there are available housing units in the city to accommodate 12 housing units to be displaced by the proposed project, construction of replacement housing elsewhere would not be necessary. Additionally, some of the existing houses on-site are unoccupied and in poor structural condition, not suitable for habitation. Demolition of these houses would not displace a substantial number of people to necessitate replacement housing elsewhere. The parcel at 4307 Park Avenue is owned by the City Housing Authority and is operating as the Artist-in-Residence, an affordable housing project in partnership with the Riverside Art Museum. One household currently resides at the Artist-in-Residence. The proposed project would remove this housing project and displace the affordable housing project. However, as required, the District will be repaying the applicable affordable housing funds back to the US. Department of Housing Authority and the City's Housing Authority. The District would also seek other partnership opportunities with the Riverside Art Museum to continue support the Artist-in Residence program and support low-income artists. Impacts would be less than significant.

8.10 PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Riverside Fire Department (RFD) currently provides fire protection and emergency medical services to the school. The nearest fire station to the project site is Station 1 – Downtown at 3401 University Avenue, about 0.5-mile northwest. Station 1 provides a fire engine, quint truck, a squad company, a bush company, ATV, a utility truck, and a battalion company. Station 4 – Eastside at 3510 Cranford Avenue is the second-nearest station, approximately 1.4 miles to the northeast. Station 4 is equipped with a fire engine and water tender. The proposed project would serve the Eastside Neighborhood students who are currently transported to schools outside of the neighborhood already being served by RFD. Project implementation could result in a slight increase in calls for fire protection and emergency medical service. However, the proposed project would be developed in compliance with the latest edition of the California Fire Code and incorporate design features such as fire sprinkler and alarm systems to minimize fire safety impacts. The site plan and emergency access plan would be reviewed and approved by the RFD. RFD would also verify that sufficient water pressure and availability are provided for the hydrants and sprinklers. The slight increase in demands for fire protection services by the proposed project is not anticipated to require a new or physically altered fire station, which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Riverside Police Department provides police service to the City of Riverside, including the project site. The project may cause a very slight increase in demands for police services during construction from possible trespass, theft, and/or vandalism. Active construction areas would be fenced and the entire campus is currently fenced and would remain secured outside of work hours. Any increase in police demands would be temporary and would not require the construction of new or expanded police facilities.

General campus activities are under the supervision of the school administrators and staff. The demand for police protection services generally corresponds to the population. Since the students who will be attending the proposed school already reside within the Eastside Neighborhood but are attending other outside schools, the student population within the neighborhood would not increase, and the police protection service demands would not be significantly impacted. An elementary school would not require the construction or expansion of existing police facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Schools?

No Impact. School services are related to the size of the residential population, the geographic area served, and community characteristics. The project would not increase the population in the attendance boundary. The project would be a benefit to the students, staff, and the community. No impact would occur.

d) Parks?

Less Than Significant Impact. See Section 5.6, *Recreation*.

e) Other public facilities?

No Impact. The project would not result in impacts associated with the provision of other new or physically altered public facilities (e.g., libraries, hospitals, childcare, teen, or senior centers). Physical impacts to public services are usually associated with population in-migration and growth, which increase the demand for public services and facilities. The proposed project would serve students from the existing Eastside Neighborhood and would not result in growth-inducing impacts to increase demands for other public facilities. Therefore, no impacts to other public facilities would occur.

8.11 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- a) **Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Water

The project site is within the RPU's water service boundaries and existing development on-site is served with adequate water facilities. Under Options 1 and 3, which disturb a total of 8.62 acres, the total water demand under the existing conditions is 5,684,258 gallons per year (3,441,924 gpy indoor water use⁴ and 2,242,334 gpy outdoor water use⁵). Under the most conservative development scenario that would have the most water demand, which would include both the Eastside Elementary School and Lincoln High School, and the joint-use field, the water demand would be 4,990,795 gpy (2,820,384 gpy indoor water use⁶ and 2,170,411 gpy outdoor water use⁷), a decrease of 693,463 gpy. Therefore, it is anticipated that the water demand would decrease under all project options.

There is an existing 30-inch transmission main and a 6-inch distribution pipeline within the Park Avenue right-of-way, and RPU has a plan to upsize the 30-inch transmission main to a 54-inch pipeline in approximately five years. RPU would require a minimum of 40-foot-wide utility easement where no structure or improvements would be allowed. The proposed project under three options would require a vacation of Park Avenue between 13th Street and 14th Street, however, the proposed project would not place any structure within the 40-foot easement. Figures 3-5 through 3-7, show proposed site plans under three options, and as shown, hardcourts would be placed under Option 1; driveway, entry court, walkway, and playfields with an amphitheater would be placed; and bus drop-off, kindergarten play area, and outdoor learning area would be placed under Option 3. These improvements would not place any above-grade structures that cannot be moved or disturbed during the utility upgrades. The development of the proposed project under all three options would not interfere with the City's ability to upsize the pipeline. Furthermore, the timing of the project construction is unknown, although for the purposes of the EIR analysis it is conservatively assumed that the construction would start in January 2026, therefore, if RPU's plan is to upgrade within approximately five years, it is possible that this water facility upgrade would occur prior to completion of the proposed school. The District is required to coordinate with RPU prior to the street vacation and/or any grading activities.

Under Option 2, the proposed project would require the vacation of 13th Street between Park Avenue and Howard Avenue. Option 2 would place turf fields on top of the vacated street, therefore, would not require an abandonment of any underground utility lines on 13th Street. Although utility improvement plans are currently unavailable, the District is required to comply with RPU's Construction Standards (Specification No. 205) and Water Rules, and provide the necessary water infrastructure to adequately serve the proposed project. The water pipeline upsizing needs would be evaluated once the preferred site plan is selected and utility plans are prepared. Prior to any site preparation or grading activities, the District is required to coordinate with RPU to provide the necessary water utility plans and get approval from RPU. Connecting to the existing RPU pipelines and

⁴ The existing indoor water use demand is based on defaults from CalEEMod.

⁵ The existing outdoor water use demand is based on the Department of Water Resources' Maximum Applied Water Allowance Calculations for New and Rehabilitated Non-Residential Landscapes calculation.

⁶ The proposed indoor water use demand is based on defaults from CalEEMod.

⁷ The proposed outdoor water use demand is based Department of Water Resources' Maximum Applied Water Allowance Calculations for New and Rehabilitated Non-Residential Landscapes calculation for Option 2 since this option has the largest outdoor landscaped area out of the three options, therefore, would represent the worst case.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

upsizing adjacent distribution lines would be part of the standard construction and would not result in significant environmental effects.

RPU has indicated that the fire hydrant at the northeast corner of 12t Street and Howard Avenue would require an upsizing if any of the fire flow distribution pipelines within 13t Street and Park Avenue were to be abandoned. Currently, there is no plan to abandon the pipelines on 13t and Park Avenue as no above-grade structures would be constructed along the existing street rights-of-way. However, once the preferred site plan option is selected, the District will be required to coordinate with RPU to provide the necessary water facility plans and get approval from RPU before any connection to the existing water pipelines can be made. If RPU determines that abandonment and associated improvements are required, the District is required to comply with RPU's Water Rules and Construction Standards before water service can be provided. Although the proposed project could require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, these improvements would not result in significant environmental effects. Impacts would be less than significant.

Wastewater Treatment

The City of Riverside Public Works Department, Wastewater Division, operates a comprehensive wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system that serves most of the city, including the project site. The City's wastewater collection system consists of over 800 miles of gravity sewers ranging from 4 to 51 inches in diameter, 414 miles of sewer laterals that are City-owned, and 20 wastewater pump stations. The treatment occurs at the Riverside Regional Water Quality Treatment Plant (RWQTP) at 5950 Acorn Street in Riverside. The RWQTP currently consists of two separate treatment plants and one common tertiary filtration plant providing preliminary, primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment for a rated capacity of 40 million gallons per day (MGD). The RWQTP is currently being expanded and retrofitted to meet the needs of future generations. The plant-wide expansion would increase the treatment capacity of the plant from 40 to 46 MGD. Assuming 9 gallons per day (GPD) of sewer per student, the proposed project is estimated to generate 720 GPD of wastewater to be treated by RWQTP. Lincoln High School is an existing use and although the joint-use park would have a restroom, the impact from this restroom facility during afterschool hours would be negligible. The RPU does not have an established sewer generation factor for park use and other reference materials for sewer generation rates also do not provide a sewer generation factor for park use. Considering the existing and planned treatment capacity of 46 MGD at RWQTP, compared to the estimated 720 GPD, any wastewater treatment impacts would be negligible. Furthermore, according to the Update of the Integrated Master Plan for the Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facilities, dated January 2020, the sewer treatment projections were determined primarily based on the population projections. The proposed project would serve the existing student population within the Eastside Neighborhood currently transported to other schools in Riverside. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in additional population growth within the City's Wastewater Division's service area. The proposed project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities that could result in or cause significant environmental effects. Impact would be less than significant.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Stormwater Drainage

As discussed in Section 8.6(c)(ii), and summarized in Table 8-5, the stormwater peak flow would decrease under Options 1 and 2 in the 100-year and 10-year stormwater events. Although the runoff peak flow would increase under Option 3, the increase would be less than 1 cfs for both 100-year and 10-year storm events, and the minimal increase would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities. Furthermore, the proposed elementary school would be required to capture runoff water under all three options in accordance with the Riverside County Design Handbook for Low Impact Development Best Management Practices (Riverside County 2011). The proposed project would be required to coordinate with the City of Riverside to connect to the existing City's drainage system; however, the proposed project is not anticipated to increase the existing runoff volume and rates. Impacts would be less than significant.

Electric Power

Electrical service within the project site is provided by RPU. New utility infrastructure and connections would be installed in coordination with RPU. It is anticipated that underground conversion of overhead facilities is not part of the proposed improvements. The electricity demand due to the proposed project is expected to consume 868,544 kilowatt hours per year (kWh/year) under the most conservative scenario under Option 2, which includes the proposed elementary school and the evening use of the joint-use park (see Table 8-2). The existing uses are estimated to consume approximately 769,122 kWh/year; therefore, an increase of 99,422 kWh/year would result in an approximately 12 percent increase from the existing conditions. Although the proposed project would require construction or relocation of new or expanded electric infrastructure, the construction would be limited to the project site and its immediate surrounding, and environmental impacts would not be significant. Additionally, such a minimal increase within the overall RPU service capacity for the entire city would not result in significant environmental effects. Impacts would be less than significant.

Natural Gas

Natural gas service within the project site is provided by Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas). There is existing natural gas infrastructure that serves the existing development within the project site. As shown in Table 8-1, implementation of the proposed project would result in a net decrease in natural gas demand from 1,279,202 kBTU/year to 828,119 kBTU/year, a decrease of 451,083 kBTU/year or 35 percent. Therefore, it is anticipated that the proposed project would not result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded natural gas facilities that could result in significant environmental effects. The District would be required to coordinate with SoCalGas to connect to the existing gas lines. Impacts would be less than significant.

Telecommunications

The project site currently provides telecommunication services to existing development. The proposed project would connect to the available telecommunication services (AT&T, Spectrum, Frontier, and Sprint) and would not require construction or relocation of new or expanded telecommunications facilities that could result in significant environmental effects.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

The proposed project would be required to meet the current Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 6) and CALGreen (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 11). Both standards contain energy-efficiency requirements for newly constructed buildings and the required compliance with these regulations would minimize water, wastewater, electricity, and natural gas demands from the proposed project.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?

Less Than Significant Impact. RPU supplies water to the project site and the surrounding community. Water would be used on-site during construction for dust suppression and other activities. The small amount of water that would be used for project construction would not result in the need for new or expanded water entitlements.

RPU's primary source of water supply is local groundwater. RPU also distributes recycled water for non-potable uses. According to the 2020 UWMP, these two locally controlled supplies have been highly reliable. RPU also has an agreement with Western Municipal Water District (WMWD) to access imported water when needed. The 2020 UWMP concluded that there are sufficient water supplies available to serve the projected growth within the RPU's service area during normal, dry, and multiple dry years through 2045. The 2020 UWMP projected future water demands based on a percentage growth rate using the DWR Population Tool (RPU 2021). Because the proposed project would serve students from the existing Eastside Neighborhood that are currently transported to other elementary schools within the RPU's water service area and would not induce unanticipated future growth, the proposed project would not require additional water supplies that were not planned in the UWMP. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Less Than Significant Impact. There are existing sewer lines along Fourteenth Street, Thirteenth Street, and Victoria Avenue (City of Riverside 2012). The proposed project would continue to serve students currently living and attending schools within the City of Riverside and would not generate an increase in the city's student population or the amount of wastewater treatment required. As discussed in Section 8.11(a), the RWQTP has a current treatment capacity of 40 MGD and a planned capacity of 46 MGD. The proposed project is projected to result in 760 GPD of sewer. The students to be served by the proposed project are being transported to other wastewater treatment demands within the city's service area. The project would not affect wastewater treatment capacity. Impact would be less than significant.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less Than Significant Impact. Demolition and construction waste would be generated and disposed of at appropriate facilities. The California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen; 24 CCR Part 1, Section 5.408.1.1) requires that at least 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste from

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

nonresidential construction operations be recycled and/or salvaged for reuse. The Riverside County Department of Waste Resources also requires projects to be recycled, reused, composted, and/or salvaged a minimum of 65 percent by weight of material and/or waste generated on-site. Therefore, the District's construction contractor is required to comply with the established performance goal during construction, and impacts would be less than significant.

The project-generated solid waste is anticipated to be disposed of at the El Sobrante Landfill in Corona, in Riverside County. El Sobrante Landfill has a permitted throughput of 16,054 tons per day, with a remaining capacity of 143,977,170 cubic yards and an estimated closing date of 2051 (CalRecycle 2022). This landfill has not exceeded its maximum permitted tonnage of 16,054 tons per day and 70,000 tons per week.

During operation, the proposed project would generate solid waste from uneaten food, packaging and serving materials, paper, cardboard, and plastic. Assuming 0.5 pounds per day per student (lbs/day)⁸ of solid waste generation factor, the proposed project is anticipated to generate approximately 400 lbs/day of solid waste. The proposed increase of 400 lbs/day of solid waste would contribute approximately 0.00001 percent to the maximum permitted tonnage to El Sobrante Landfill; therefore, the project would not cause the El Sobrante Landfill to exceed its permitted capacity. Furthermore, the students to be served by the proposed project would be served by the same landfill, even if the students were to attend other schools within the District. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The District currently complies with or incorporates federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and would continue this practice. Section 5.408 (Construction Waste Reduction, Disposal, and Recycling) of CALGreen (24 CCR Part 11) requires that at least 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste from nonresidential construction operations be recycled and/or salvaged for reuse. Construction of the project would adhere to these established standards. No impact would occur.

8.12 WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The project site and the surrounding community are not in a very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ) identified by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Area map (CAL FIRE 2022). The project site is also not identified as having high or very high fire hazard rating by the City's General Plan, Figure PS-7, Fire Hazard Areas (City of Riverside 2018). Therefore, no impact would occur.

⁸ This analysis conservatively assumed solid waste generation factor of 0.5 lbs per day per student.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

- b) **Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?**

No Impact. As stated in Section 8.12(a), the project site is not in a VHFHSZ mapped by CAL FIRE or the City of Riverside Public Safety Element. Because the project site is not in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as VHFHSZ, no impact related to wildfire would occur.

- c) **Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**

No Impact. As stated in Section 8.12(a), the project site is not in a VHFHSZ mapped by CAL FIRE or the City of Riverside Public Safety Element. Because the project site is not in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as VHFHSZ, no impact related to wildfire would occur.

- d) **Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?**

No Impact. As stated in Section 8.12(a), the project site is not in a VHFHSZ mapped by CAL FIRE or the City of Riverside Public Safety Element. Because the project site is not in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as VHFHSZ, no impact related to wildfire would occur.

8.13 REFERENCES

- California Department of Conservation. 1997. California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model.
- California Department of Finance (DOF). 2021, January 1. Table 2: E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 1/1/2021. <https://dof.ca.gov/2022/03/15/e-5-population-and-housing-estimates-for-cities-counties-and-the-state-2011-2021-with-2010-census-benchmark/>
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2021 (accessed). CNDDDB Maps and Data, CNDDDB QuickView Tool in BIOS. <https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios/?tool=cnddbQuick>
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Office of the State Fire Marshal (CAL FIRE). 2022, June 20. Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps. FHSZ Viewer. <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2022. Scenic Highways, State Scenic Highway Map, California State Scenic Highway System Map. <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2022. SGMA Data Viewer Application. <https://sgma.water.ca.gov/webgis/?appid=SGMADataViewer#gwstorage>

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

- California Energy Commission (CEC). 2018a. Energy Commission Adopts Standards Requiring Solar Systems for New Homes, First in Nation. News release. <https://www.energy.ca.gov/news/2018-05/energy-commission-adopts-standards-requiring-solar-systems-new-homes-first>.
- . 2018b. 2019 Building Energy and Efficiency Standards Frequently Asked Questions. https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-03/Title_24_2019_Building_Standards_FAQ_ada.pdf.
- . 2019. Amendments to the Building Energy Efficiency Standards (2022 Energy Code) Draft Environmental Report. CEC-400-2021-077-D. <https://www.energy.ca.gov/programs-and-topics/programs/building-energy-efficiency-standards/2022-building-energy-efficiency>
- California Geological Survey (CGS). 2008, September 11. “Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California,” California Department of Conservation.
- . 2013, October. http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/information/publications/cgs_notes/note_48/Documents/Note_48.pdf
- California Office of Emergency Services (OES), 2016. Dam Inundation Map.
- California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA). 2015, January. California Construction Best Management Practices Handbook.
- CalRecycle. 2022, May 10 (accessed). SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details, El Sobrante Landfill (33-AA-0217). <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/2280?siteID=2402>
- Department of the Interior (DOI). 2017, December. “The Migratory Bird Treaty Act Does Not Prohibit Incidental Take.”
- Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP). 2016. California Important Farmland Finder. <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html>.
- Division of Mine Reclamation (DMR). 2022, June 22. Mines Online. <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/mol/index.html>.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2008, August 27. FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) Viewer. <https://hazards-fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd>
- Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM), 2022, June 22. Well Finder. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/wellfinder/#openModal/-118.94276/37.12009/6>
- PlaceWorks. 2019. Eastside School Site Geological and Environmental Hazards Assessment, Riverside Unified School District.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

- . 2022. Conceptual Hydrology Study, Eastside Neighborhood School, Riverside Unified School District.
- Redfin. 2022, March 28 (accessed). Homes for Sale, Riverside, Riverside, CA.
<https://www.redfin.com/city/15935/CA/Riverside/filter/status=active+comingsoon+contingent+pending,viewport=34.01606:33.85455:-117.24826:-117.50095>
- Riverside, City of. 2007. Zoning Map of the City of Riverside.
<https://riversideca.gov/planning/pdf/Zoning-Map.pdf>
- . 2012, November. City of Riverside General Plan 2025. <https://riversideca.gov/cedd/planning/city-plans/general-plan-0>
- . 2018, February (amended). City of Riverside General Plan 2025, Public Safety Element.
https://riversideca.gov/cedd/sites/riversideca.gov.chedd/files/pdf/planning/general-plan/18_Public_Safety_Element_with%20maps.pdf
- . 2019. Code of Ordinances.
https://library.municode.com/ca/riverside/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_TTT13STSITRTR_CH13.25TRSHSU_13.25.020RETRTRAR.
- Riverside, County of. 2011. Riverside County Design Handbook for Low Impact Development Best Management Practices.
- Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Riverside County Flood). 2017, January 18. Hydromodification Susceptibility Documentation Report and Mapping: Santa Ana Region.
- Riverside Public Utilities (RPU). 2021, July 1. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan.
<https://riversideca.gov/utilities/sites/riversideca.gov.utilities/files/pdf/residents/RPU%20Final%202020%20UWMP%20%282%29.pdf>
- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (Santa Ana RWQCB). 2012, October 22. Water Quality Management Plan.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2018. National Wetlands Inventory.
<https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/>.
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 2022, June 1 (accessed) Areas of Land Subsidence in California.
https://ca.water.usgs.gov/land_subsidence/california-subsidence-areas.html
- Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA). 2022. RCA MSHCP Information Map.
<https://wrcrca.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=a73e69d2a64d41c29ebd3acd67467abd>
- Zillow.com. 2022, March 28 (accessed). For Sale, Riverside, CA. https://www.zillow.com/homes/riverside,-riverside,-ca_rb/