

MINUTE ITEM
This Calendar Item No. 34
was approved as Minute Item
No. 34 by the State Lands
Commission by a vote of 3
to 0 at its 5/31/89
meeting.

CALENDAR ITEM

A 73

34

S 36

05/31/89
SA 5660
Kiley
Small

AUTHORIZE SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT AND ACCEPT THE BID OF LEWIS
HOMES FOR PURCHASE OF THE PROPERTY PURSUANT TO THE AMENDED
AGREEMENT

APPLICANT: Riverside Community College District
4800 Magnolia Avenue
Riverside, California 92506-1299

At its meeting on June 30, 1988, the Commission authorized the staff to negotiate an agreement with the Riverside Community College District (District) which would result in the sale and subsequent development of a 67-acre parcel of school land in the City of Norco, Riverside County (the property). At its meeting on February 6, 1989, the Commission authorized the staff to execute a contract and agency agreement with the District whereby the District would act as the agent of the Commission to conduct a public auction of the property. The District had previously caused a tentative subdivision map to be made and filed for the property. The proposal called for the District to reserve lots 65 through 71 from auction, with the District paying the State for those lots at the "per-acre" price developed by the auction of the remaining lots. The Commission reserved the right to approve the highest bidder for the remaining lots.

Pursuant to the agency agreement, the District conducted the auction on February 24, 1989. Four bidders were present and each submitted a sealed bid, together with a cashier's check for \$100,000, as required by the bidding process. Sealed bids

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 34 (CONT'D)

ranged from \$1,395,000 to \$1,425,000. Structured oral bidding followed. The three highest bids following the oral auction were:

1. \$1,740,000 by Woodcrest Homes
2. \$2,300,000 by Bih-Hwey Lin
3. \$2,501,000 by Lewis Homes of California

Bidding was closed, and Lewis Homes was conditionally accepted as high bidder, subject to Commission approval. The College District, acting as the Commission's agent, has been working with Lewis Homes to firm up various aspects of the proposed final subdivision of the State's parcel.

Staff met with Lewis Homes, their engineers, and the District, on March 21, 1989, to discuss details of the sales transaction. Because of the necessity for preparation and approval of a Final Map, Lewis Homes and the District agreed that it would be desirable for the entire parcel which has been tentatively subdivided to be conveyed to Lewis, with Lewis and the District working out a side agreement to convey the lots desired by the District to the District. Staff believes that approach is acceptable, subject to Commission approval, since the Commission will receive the full purchase price for the parcel from escrow, including both the \$2,501,000 bid at auction and the "per-acre" price to be paid by the District for the lots it desires.

In addition, pursuant to the terms of the Agency Agreement with the College District, the College District's costs of obtaining the tentative map, and otherwise acting as the Commission's agent, were to be a credit against the purchase of the land to be conveyed to the District, up to a limit of \$140,000.

Staff has determined that costs incurred by the District, to date, meet or exceed \$140,000, and that the District is entitled to the full amount of the credit. The value of the lands to be received by the District is \$158,463. The amount due after offset is \$18,463.

Staff has prepared and submitted for approval a supplemental agreement which reflects the intent of the parties. Pursuant to the agreement, staff would transfer fee title, together with rights to the non-exclusive easements described in Exhibit "A",

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 34 (CONT'D)

to Lewis Homes. The total price to be received by the Commission for its land will be \$2,519,463, after credit to the District.

Staff has recently been informed that the Navy Fleet Administration Center in Norco was listed on the California Department of Health Services Bond Expenditure Plan. The Commission's school land exchange parcel which is proposed for sale, and the adjacent Riverside Community College District site, were both once part of the Navy's Fleet Administration Center. The Department of Health Services has not considered this site to be a high priority to determine if the site actually should be retained on the Bond Expenditure Plan.

In order for Lewis Homes to utilize the property, it must be assured that the land does not contain potentially hazardous materials. Therefore, because of the recent discovery of the listing on the Bond Expenditure Plan, Lewis insists that a condition of sale be that the land proposed for sale is not listed on the Bond Expenditure Plan and that the Commission obtain a determination from the Department of Health Services that the property is not a border-zone property as provided in Health and Safety Code Section 25359.7. Staff believes that this is a reasonable condition.

Lewis has had prepared a preliminary site assessment which did not disclose any hazardous materials on the site. The Riverside Community College District has identified some sites on its land which may have hazardous materials, but recent sampling and chemical testing have not indicated that a significant problem exists affecting the Commission's property. Because the District intends to commence construction within the next two months, it will soon submit a preliminary site assessment of its property to the Department of Health Services. The District intends to request a determination regarding whether its property is on the Bond Expenditure list or is a border-zone property.

Staff intends to work with the Department of Health Services (DHS) to determine whether the Commission's parcel was actually included within the site described in the Bond Expenditure Plan (BEP), whether the site was included in the plan by mistake or inadvertence, and, if the site was correctly included, what action would need to be taken to alleviate DHS' concerns and cause the removal of the parcel from the BEP. Since Lewis will need as much certainty as possible regarding this matter, Staff will also request a determination from the Department of Health Services as to whether the Commission's land should be classified as a border-zone property. Although staff does not expect the Department of Health Services to require sampling

(REVISED 05/30/89)

-3-

CALENDAR PAGE	200 ²
MINUTE PAGE	1604 ²

0.1760

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 34 (CONT'D)

and testing, such a program may become necessary. As part of the sales agreement, Lewis has agreed to have performed the necessary sampling, testing, and report preparation as long as the Commission reimburses it for such costs. In the event the sale is consummated, the cost would be deducted from the purchase price. The Agreement would provide for a maximum of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) for the sampling, testing, and report preparation.

In the event the Commission's school lands are not removed from the Bond Expenditure list and/or are determined to be a border-zone property, and conditions are imposed which limit the utility of the land to Lewis, then staff will return to the Commission and identify the available options.

STATUTORY AND OTHER REFERENCES:

- A. P.R.C.: Div. 6, Parts 1 and 2; Div. 13.
- B. Cal. Code Regs.: Title 2, Div. 3;
Title 14, Div. 6.

AB 884:

N/A.

OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION:

1. On September 7, 1988, the Norco City Council adopted Resolution 88-41 which approved tentative Tract Map 23507, submitted by Riverside Community College District for the affected parcel, subject to compliance with 43 conditions as set forth in said resolution. The resolution also contains a findings to the effect that: "Development of the proposed subdivision is not likely to have any significant adverse effects on its environs and a Negative Declaration is proposed to be issued for said project, as measures for mitigation of perceived adverse environmental effects to levels of non-significance are incorporated into conditions for project approvals."
2. Pursuant to the Norco City Council's finding, a Negative Declaration was prepared and approved by the City of Norco. The State Lands Commission staff has reviewed such document.

(REVISED 05/30/89)

-4-

CALENDAR PAGE	200
MINUTE PAGE	1605 ³

1761

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 34 (CONT'D)

3. Staff has filed, pursuant to P.R.C. 6373, an amended General Plan for this activity with the Legislature.

EXHIBITS:

- A. Property to be Conveyed to Lewis Homes.
- B. Amended General Plan.
- C. Notice of Determination, Negative Declaration - City of Norco.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COMMISSION:

1. FIND THAT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED AND ADOPTED FOR THIS PROJECT BY THE CITY OF NORCO AND THAT THE COMMISSION HAS REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED THE INFORMATION CONTAINED THEREIN.
2. FIND THAT THE PROJECT, AS AMENDED AND APPROVED, WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.
3. FIND THAT AN AMENDED GENERAL PLAN FOR THIS ACTIVITY WAS PREPARED BY COMMISSION STAFF AND FILED WITH THE LEGISLATURE PURSUANT TO P.R.C. 6373.
4. APPROVE THE SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COLLEGE DISTRICT, AND THE STATE LANDS COMMISSION AND LEWIS HOMES IN SUBSTANTIALLY THE FORM ON FILE IN THE PRINCIPAL OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION.
5. ACCEPT LEWIS HOMES HIGH BID PURSUANT TO THE AGREEMENT AS AMENDED.
6. ACCEPT THE SUM OF \$2,659,463, LESS A CREDIT OF \$140,000 TO RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, AS FULL COMPENSATION FOR THE PROPERTIES DESCRIBED IN EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED.
7. AUTHORIZE THE ISSUANCE OF A PATENT FOR THE PROPERTIES DESCRIBED IN EXHIBIT "A" TO LEWIS HOMES OF CALIFORNIA.
8. FIND THAT, ON CLOSE OF ESCROW FOR THIS TRANSACTION, THE MATERIAL TERMS OF THE AMENDED CONTRACT AND AGENCY AGREEMENT DATED FEBRUARY 24, 1989 AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT (EXHIBIT "E") ENTERED INTO BETWEEN THE COMMISSION, THE DISTRICT AND LEWIS WILL HAVE BEEN FULFILLED AS THEY AFFECT THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DISTRICT AND THE COMMISSION TO EACH OTHER AND THAT UPON CLOSE OF ESCROW THE CONTRACT AND AGENCY AGREEMENT WILL BE OF NO FURTHER FORCE AND EFFECT.

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 34 (CONT'D)

9. AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO APPROVE TESTING COSTS UP TO \$50,000.
10. AUTHORIZE STAFF AND THE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO TAKE ALL STEPS NECESSARY, INCLUDING PROCESSING ESCROW, APPEARING IN ANY COURT ACTION, AND ANY OTHER STEPS NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THIS TRANSACTION.

EXHIBIT "A"

SA 5660

LAND DESCRIPTION

PARCEL 1

Those portions of the southeast quarter of Section 11, the southwest quarter of Section 12, the northwest quarter of Section 13, and the northeast quarter of Section 14, in T3S, R7W, in the Rancho La Sierra, City of Norco, County of Riverside, State of California, as per map of Sectionalized Survey of said Rancho recorded in Book 6, page 70 of Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County, described as a whole as follows:

COMMENCING at the northwest corner of Lot 1 of Block 10 of Riverside Orange Heights Tract as shown on that map recorded in Book 6, page 74 of Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County; thence east along the northerly line of said Riverside Orange Heights Tract, 2293 feet to the southwest corner of that certain parcel of land conveyed to the Tonneson Citrus Company by Deed recorded November 11, 1915, in Book 432, page 97 of deeds in the Office of the County Recorder of said County, said southwest corner being the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; thence West 1010.00 feet along the northerly line of said Riverside Orange Heights Tract; thence N 00° 00' 16" E 2004.79 feet to the south line of Lot B of Norco Farms, Tract No. 5 as shown on that map recorded in Book 14, page 60, 61, and 62 of Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County; thence east 154.61 feet along the south line of Lot B and the south line of Lot J of said Norco Farms, Tract No. 5 to the southeast corner of said Lot J; thence North 806.05 feet along the east line of said Lot J; thence S 89° 59' 52" E 855.31 feet, to a point that bears N 00° 00' 16" E from the northwest corner of that certain parcel of land conveyed to Tonneson Citrus Company, herein before described; thence S 00° 00' 16" W 2150.80 feet to said northwest corner; thence South 660 feet along the west line of said parcel to the true point of beginning.

PARCEL 2

That portion of Section 13, T3S, R7W, in the Rancho La Sierra, City of Norco, County of Riverside, State of California, as per map of Sectionalized Survey of said Rancho recorded in Book 6, page 70 of Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County, described as a whole as follows:

COMMENCING at the northwest corner of Lot 1 of Block 10 of Riverside Orange Heights Tract as shown on that map recorded in Book 6, page 74 of Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County; thence east along the northerly line of said Riverside Orange Heights Tract, 2293 feet to the southwest corner of that certain parcel of land conveyed to the Tonneson Citrus Company by Deed recorded November 11, 1915, in Book 432, page 97 of deeds in the Office of the County Recorder of said County; thence north 660 feet along the west line of said parcel to the northwest corner thereof and the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; thence N 00° 00' 16" E 60.00 feet; thence East 2040 feet along a line parallel with the north line of said parcel conveyed to Tonneson Citrus Company, to the northerly extension of the west line of Mountain Avenue, as said avenue is shown on Parcel Map 72-20 recorded in Book 5, page 90 of Parcel Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County; thence South 60.00 feet along said extension to the north line of the parcel conveyed to Tonneson Citrus Company; thence West 2040 feet along said north line to the true point of beginning.

CALENDAR PAGE	200	6
MINUTE PAGE	1608	

PARCEL 1E

A non-exclusive easement for ingress and egress, street, and public utility purposes over and across that portion of Lot J (Western Avenue) of Norco Farms Tract No. 5 in the City of Norco, County of Riverside, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 14, page 60 of Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County, described as a whole as follows:

BEGINNING at the southeast corner of Lot J of Norco Farms Tract No. 5 as shown on that map recorded in Book 14, pages 60, 61 and 62 of Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County; thence North 2868.64 feet along the east line of said Lot J to the south line of Parcel 1 in Quitclaim Deed from the United States of America to the State of California, recorded March 30, 1962, in Book 3108, page 188 of Official Records in the Office of the County Recorder of said County; thence West 30.00 feet along the south line of said Parcel 1 to the centerline of said Lot J; thence South 2868.64 feet along the centerline of said Lot J to the south line thereof; thence East 30.00 feet along said south line to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 2E

A non-exclusive easement for ingress and egress, street, and public utility purposes over and across those portions of Lot B (Third Street) and Lot J (Western Avenue) of Norco Farms Tract No. 5 in the City of Norco, County of Riverside, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 14, page 60 of Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County, described as a whole as follows:

COMMENCING at the southeast corner of Lot J of Norco Farms Tract No. 5 as shown on that map recorded in Book 14, pages 60, 61 and 62 of Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County; thence West 30.00 feet along the south line of said Lot J to the centerline thereof and the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; thence West 124.61 feet along the south line of said Lot J and the south line of Lot B of said Norco Farms Tract No. 5; thence North 30.00 feet to the centerline of said Lot B; thence East 124.61 feet along said centerline and its prolongation to the centerline of said Lot J; thence South 30.00 feet along the centerline of said Lot J to the true point of beginning.

END OF DESCRIPTION

REVIEWED May 26, 1989 BY BIU 1.

CALENDAR PAGE	200 ² 7
MINUTE PAGE	1609

10-1765

EXHIBIT "B"

AMENDED GENERAL PLAN

The State Lands Commission proposes to sell a 67.17 acre parcel of State school land in the City of Norco, Riverside County.

The Riverside Community College District and Lewis Homes have applied for purchase of the property. The proposed land use for the property is to utilize portions for planned junior college campus and develop portions as residential subdivision. Proceeds from the proposed sale would be deposited in the School Land Bank Account.

CALENDAR PAGE	200 . 8
MINUTE PAGE	1610

TITLE 73

(Register 73, No. 29 - 7-18-88)

RESOURCES AGENCY

(p. 324.7)

EXHIBIT "C"

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

TO: Office of Planning and Research
 1400 Tenth Street
 Sacramento, California 95814
 or
 County Clerk
 County of Riverside
4050 Main Street
Riverside, CA 91501

FROM: (Public Agency) CITY OF NORCO
3954 Old Hammer Ave.
P.O. Box 628
Norco, California 91760

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code

Project Title TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 23507
 State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to State Clearinghouse) _____
 Contact Person Bill Young Telephone Number (714) 735-3900
 Project Location Southerly of Fourth Street at terminus of Western Avenue.
 Project Description 100-lot single-family subdivision in the A-1-20 zone.

This is to advise that the City of Norco (Lead Agency or Responsible Agency)

has approved the above described project and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project will Not have significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
 A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The EIR or Negative Declaration and record of project approval may be examined at: City of Norco

3. Mitigation measures were, were not, made a condition of the approval of the project.

4. A statement of Overriding Considerations was, was not, adopted for this project.

Date Received for Filing JUL 26 1988

CLERK of the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
County of Riverside, State of California

Bill Young
Signature
Director of Community Development
Title

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21000-21174, Public Resources Code.

HISTORY:

1. New Appendix D filed 12-14-73 as an emergency; effective upon filing. Certificate of Compliance Included (Register 73, No. 56).
2. Repealer and new Appendix D filed 1-3-75; designated effective 4-1-75 (Register 75 No. 21)
3. Amendment filed 2-2-78; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 78 No. 6).
4. Amendment filed 5-8-80; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 80 No. 19).

CALENDAR PAGE	200
MINUTE PAGE	1611

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
NEGATIVE DECLARATION
CITY OF NORCO, CALIFORNIA

1. NAME OF PROPONENT: RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
2. PROJECT TYPE: residential
3. PROJECT LOCATION: Southerly of 4th St. at terminus of Western Avenue.
3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 100-lot single-family subdivision in the A-1-20 zone.
5. ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER OF PROPONENT: 4800 Magnolia Avenue,
Riverside, CA 92506 (714) 684-3240 (Mike Maas)
6. DATE INITIAL STUDY WAS SUBMITTED: 6/10/88
7. AGENCY REQUIRING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: City of Norco
8. NAME OF PROPOSAL, IF APPLICABLE: n/a
9. DATE RECEIVED BY LEAD AGENCY: 6/10/88

A. FINDINGS:

It is the opinion of the Norco Env. Review Board that this project will have no significant impact upon the environment within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended.

B. REASONS:

1. This project is not in conflict with environmental plans and goals that have been adopted by the community where the project is to be located, and is in conformity with the Norco General Plan.
2. This project will not have a substantial or demonstrable negative aesthetic effect.
3. This project will not have any effects on rare or endangered species of animals or plants, nor is this site inhabited by such animals or plant life.
4. This project will not cause any interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.
5. This project does not breach any published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control.
6. This project will not result in any effect on air or water quality, or on ambient noise levels for adjoining areas.
7. This project will not contaminate a public water supply system or adversely affect under-ground water.
8. This project cannot cause flooding, erosion or silting.
9. This project will not expose people or structures to any geological hazards.
10. This project will not result in a displacement of people.
11. This project does not appear to generate any environmental or public controversy.
12. This project will have no effects on the Environment as stated under Section 15022 of the California Quality Act of 1971 as amended.

DATE ADOPTED: 7/13/88

DATE EFFECTIVE: 8/13/88

SIGNATURE: Dore W. Youngst

DATE: 7/19/88

DATE PUBLISHED: _____

CALENDAR PAGE

200 of 10

MINUTE PAGE

1612

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
INITIAL STUDY
CITY OF NORCO, CALIFORNIA
(To be completed by Lead Agency)**

TTM 23507

I. BACKGROUND

1. NAME OF PROPONENT: RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
2. PROJECT TYPE: Residential development on approximately 49 acres
3. PROJECT LOCATION: South of southern end of Western Avenue
4. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Residential development of 100 single-family units on about 49 acres.
5. ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER OF PROPONENT: 4800 Magnolia Avenue, Riverside, CA 92506 (714) 684-3240
6. DATE OF CHECKLIST SUBMITTED: 6/10/88
7. AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST: CITY OF NORCO
8. NAME OF PROPOSAL, IF APPLICABLE: TTM 23507
9. DATE RECEIVED BY LEAD AGENCY: 6/10/88

II. ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The City Department having original jurisdiction over the project at the time of filing an application for approval thereof shall answer the following questions by placing a check in the appropriate space. (When the phrases "significant change" or "significantly affect" are used hereinbelow, they shall be deemed to mean "substantial adverse impact.") Data provided by the applicant on the completed Environmental Information Form shall be attached to this completed form.

(Explanations of all "yes" and "maybe" answers are required on attached sheets.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>MAYBE</u>	<u>NO</u>
1. EARTH: Will the proposal result in:			
a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?	___	___	<u>X</u>
b. Disruptions, displacements, compaction or over-covering of the soil?	<u>X</u>	___	___
c. Will the project involve construction of facilities on unstable soil or under adverse geological conditions?	___	___	<u>X</u>
d. Will the project involve construction of facilities on a slope of 15 percent or greater extending a distance of 100 lineal feet or more?	___	___	<u>X</u>
e. Change in topography or ground surface relief features?	___	___	___

CALENDAR PAGE 200
MINUTE PAGE 1613

	YES	MAYBE	NO
f. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?	—	—	X
g. An increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?	—	—	X
h. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake?	—	—	X
i. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?	—	—	X
j. Is the project site located on, or adjacent to a known earthquake fault?	—	—	X
2. AIR: Will the proposal result in:			
a. Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?	—	—	X
b. The creation of objectionable odors?	—	—	X
c. Could the project result in the generation of significant amounts of dust, fumes, smoke, odors, particulate matter or chemical aerosols during or following construction?	—	X	—
d. Alteration or air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?	—	—	X
3. WATER: Will the proposal result in:			
a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?	—	—	X
b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff?	X	—	—
c. Alterations to the course or flow of flood waters?	—	—	X
d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?	—	—	X
e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?	—	—	X

CALENDAR PAGE 200
 BIRSITE PAGE 1614

- | | YES | MAYBE | NO |
|---|-----|-------|----|
| f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters? | — | X | — |
| g. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations? | — | X | — |
| h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies? | — | — | X |
| i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves? | — | X | — |
| j. Will the project involve construction of facilities in a flood plain? | — | — | X |
| k. Will the project entail the acquisition of water from wells or surface sources for commercial and/or non-domestic use? | — | — | X |

4. PLANT LIFE: Will the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, microflora and aquatic plants)? | X | — | — |
| b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants? | — | — | X |
| c. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species? | — | — | X |
| d. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop? | — | — | X |
| e. Will the project cause any mature or scenic trees to be removed or relocated? | X | — | — |

5. ANIMAL LIFE: Will the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Change in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects or microfauna)? | X | — | — |
| b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals? | — | — | X |
| c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals? | — | — | X |
| d. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat? | — | — | X |

CALENDAR PAGE	200.13
MINUTE PAGE	1615

e. Does the project area serve as a habitat, food source, nesting place, breeding place, source of water, etc. for rare or endangered wildlife or fish species?

___ ___ X

f. Could the project significantly affect the habitat, food source, nesting place, source of water, etc. for rare or endangered wildlife or fish species?

___ ___ X

6. LAND USE:

a. Could the construction and/or operation of the project significantly change present land use in the vicinity of the project site or land uses in areas removed from the project site?

___ ___ X

b. Could the project significantly affect the use of a recreational area or an area of important aesthetic value?

___ ___ X

c. Could the project significantly affect the functioning of an established residential neighborhood or commercial or industrial area? Examples of such effects include changes in traffic patterns, access, or the introduction of activities not presently found in the area.

___ X ___

d. Could the project result in the displacement of residents in the immediate environs of the proposed project?

___ ___ X

e. Are any of the natural or man-made features in the project area unique, (that is, not found in other parts of the City)? Unique features include those areas, structures, biological phenomena, etc. that exhibit characteristics not readily found in other areas of the City.

___ ___ X

f. Could the project result in the erosion of agricultural lands?

___ ___ X

g. Could the project serve to encourage development of presently undeveloped areas or intensify development of already developed areas? Examples include the introduction of such facilities as streets, water mains or sewerage lines in such a manner as to encourage development or intensification of the use of an area.

___ ___ X

7. NOISE: Will the proposal result in:
- a. Increases in existing noise levels? YES MAYBE NO
 - b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels? YES MAYBE NO
 - c. Could the project result in the generation of significant amounts of noise during or following construction, the level of which exceeds those existing in the project area?
 During construction YES MAYBE NO
8. LIGHT AND GLARE: Will the proposal produce new light or glare? YES MAYBE NO
9. NATURAL RESOURCES: Will the proposal result in:
- a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources? YES MAYBE NO
 - b. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource including agricultural land and open space. YES MAYBE NO
10. RISK OF UPSET:
- a. Does the proposal involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions? YES MAYBE NO
 - b. Will the project involve the application, use, or disposal of potentially hazardous materials, such as toxic substances, radio-active wastes, pesticides and herbicides? YES MAYBE NO
11. POPULATION: Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area? YES MAYBE NO
12. HOUSING: Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing? YES MAYBE NO
13. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION: Will the proposal result in:
- a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement? YES MAYBE NO
 - b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking? YES MAYBE NO
 - c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems? YES MAYBE NO

	YES	MAYBE	NO
d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?	---	X	---
e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?	---	---	X
f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?	---	---	X
14. PUBLIC SERVICES: Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:			
a. Fire protection?	X	---	---
b. Police protection?	X	---	---
c. Schools?	X	---	---
d. Parks or other recreational facilities, including roads?	---	---	X
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	X	---	---
f. Other governmental services?	---	X	---
15. ENERGY: Will the proposal result in:			
a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?	---	---	X
b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?	---	---	X
16. UTILITIES: Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:			
a. Power or natural gas?	---	X	---
b. Communications systems?	---	X	---
c. Water?	X	---	---
d. Sewer or septic tanks?	X	---	---
e. Storm water drainage?	X	---	---
f. Solid waste and disposal?	---	---	X
g. Will the proposed project require public services from an agency, district or public utility which is currently operating at or new capacity?	---	---	X

CALENDAR PAGE 200-18
 MINUTE PAGE 1618

YES MAYBE NO

17. HUMAN HEALTH: Will the proposal result in:

- a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?
- b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?

----- X
 ----- X

18. AESTHETICS: Will the proposal result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?

----- X -----

19. RECREATION: Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?

----- X -----

20. ARCHEOLOGICAL/HISTORICAL:

- a. Will the proposal result in an alteration of a significant archeological or historical site, structure, object or building, including surrounding areas which are important to the appreciation of the site itself?
- b. Could the project significantly affect any unique man-made or natural features in the project area?

----- X
 ----- X

21. Will the project employ equipment which could interfere with existing communication and/or defense systems?

----- X -----

22. Will the project result in the introduction of activities not currently found within the community?

----- X -----

23. Is the project located within the flight path or noise impact area of an airport?

----- X -----

24. Will the project vary from adopted community plans, policies or goals?

----- X -----

25. Does the project involve lands currently protected under the Williamson Act or an Open Space Easement?

----- X -----

26. Is the site for the proposed project adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a Scenic Corridor?

----- X -----

27. Will the project obstruct scenic views from existing residential areas, public lands, or public roads?

X -----

CALENDAR PAGE	200 17
MINUTE PAGE	1619

- 28. Will the project require a variance from established environmental standards of Federal, State or County agencies (air, water, noise, etc.)?
- 29. Will the project require certification, authorization, issuance of a permit, or other type approval by any State, Federal or County agency?
- 30. Will the proposed project require a permit or other approval from any County, State or Federal agencies, including but not limited to:
 - State Water Resources Control Board
 - Regional Water Quality Control Board
 - (Santa Ana Region)
 - State Dept. of Public Health
 - Riverside County Air Pollution Control District:
 - U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
 - Riverside County Department of Health
 - U. S. Department of Defense
 - Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

31. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)
- c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)
- d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

III. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

DETERMINATION - (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation and the review of the Environmental Impact Review Committee:

 I find the proposed project (XUJ) NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

 ✓ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on the attached sheet will be required to be implemented as Conditions for Approval of project development and/or occupancy. A **NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.**

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

Date: 7/13/88

Gene W. Young, Jr.
(signature)

For _____

CALENDAR PAGE	200 19
MINUTE PAGE	1621

July 5, 1988
88DCD178

TTM 23507
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT COMMENTS

- 1b. Soils will be compacted and over-covered, resulting in a lowering of soil absorption rates. Adequate drainage design will eliminate risk of flooding.
- 1e. Topography will be altered slightly during construction. The site is already disturbed so further alteration is insignificant.
- 2c. Significant amounts of dust could be created during grading of project site. This can be mitigated by wetting the ground during grading and ceasing construction during periods of high winds.
- 3b. Soils will be covered, reducing absorption rates. Drainage patterns will be altered; however, adequate drainage culverts and drains will be constructed to mitigate any potential drainage problems.
- 3f. Potential for redirection of flow of ground waters due to grading. Conformance to approved grading plan will mitigate said potential for significant effect.
- 3g. Absorption rates will be lowered at project site, resulting in lowered additions to ground water bodies immediately beneath the project site. This is not significant since ground water levels are relatively high due to the project site's proximity to the Santa Ana River.
- 4a. Biological impacts to vegetation in the grassland and planted woodlands are insignificant since most of the species are non-native and typical of urban and agricultural areas throughout Riverside County. No mitigation is needed for this impact.
- 4e. A few mature trees will be removed during construction. This is not a significant impact because the trees are not native, and street trees will be required in replacement of those removed.
- 5a. The site is habitat for common rodents. Grading and development of the site will eliminate the habitat. No rare or endangered wildlife species have been identified on the site, and there are no riparian woodlands on the site to provide habitat or feeding grounds for endangered species. Prior to grading, consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service will be required.

CALENDAR PAGE
MINUTE PAGE

20020
1622

- 6c. Construction on currently vacant land will increase traffic in the area. This will be mitigated by constructing roads to serve the project site and eliminate use of currently existing surface streets in the area.
- 7a. There will be an increase in existing noise levels with the addition of 100 residential units. However, the noise generated will be typical to residential neighborhoods and will not negatively impact the project or surrounding existing neighborhoods.
- 7c. A short-term impact will be significant noise by trucks and machinery during construction. This is not significant because construction will only occur during daylight hours and will only be a temporary impact.
11. The construction of the 100 single-family dwelling units will increase the local population by about 300 people. This is not significant because it is within the growth forecast of the City of Norco and the County of Riverside.
- 13a. See response to #6c.
- 14a, b, c, e, and f: Demand for public services will increase due to the project. These impacts have already been considered and are either within the capacity of the services or shall be paid for by the project itself.
16. New systems will be provided by the developer.
18. Views of open grass lands and rolling slopes will be eliminated. These views have no residential areas facing them. Only brief views of the site are found along Hamner Avenue.
27. See response to #18.

GWY/SU:sd