

Environmental Checklist Form

City of Desert Hot Springs, California

1. **Project Name:** Eagle Pointe
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Desert Hot Springs
65950 Pierson Blvd.
Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Art Davis
(760)329-6411, ext. 234
4. **Project Location:** At the northwest corner of Pierson Boulevard and Golden Eagle Way
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** The Ultimate Return
255 N. El Cielo, Suite 677
Palm Springs, CA 92262
6. **General Plan Designation:** Residential Low Density
7. **Zoning Designation:** R-L/Residential Low Density
8. **Description of Project:** The original Specific Plan and two tentative tract maps proposed development totaling 221 detached, single-family residences on 77.21± gross acres. The two tentative tract maps will consist of 122 lots (TTM 30540) and 99 lots (TTM 30539). The Riverside County Flood Channel (3.68 acres) runs through the project diagonally flowing from the northeast to the southwest and separates the two tracts. The developer proposed to designate about 3.05 acres as a wildlife corridor reserve. This project seeks to amend the specific plan and tract maps to create a portion of land in the northern section for the provision of storm water retention mitigation and then smaller lot sizes to make up for this lost land. The amended proposal designates 104 lots on 32.75 acres for TTM 30539 and 160 lots on 44.46 acres for TTM 30540. The streets are configured differently in the new northern section. And since the Multi-Species Habitat Plan has not been approved the original portion of land set aside for habitat preservation in the south west corner of the project has been eliminated and is now shown with developable lots.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** Property to the south, north and west are currently vacant and are zoned for low density, residential development. The property to the east, across Golden Eagle Way, is the site of the Desert Hot Springs High School.
10. **Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** Riverside County Flood Control, Palm Springs Unified School District, Mission Springs Water District, Verizon, Southern California Gas, Southern California Edison, Coachella Valley Assoc. of Governments, California Department of Fish and Game

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☒ Aesthetics | ☐ Agricultural Resources |
| ☒ Air Quality | ☒ Biological Resources |
| ☐ Cultural Resources | ☐ Geology/Soils |
| ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials | ☒ Hydrology/Water Quality |

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Land Use/Planning | ☐ Mineral Resources |
| ☐ Noise | ☐ Population/Housing |
| ☐ Public Services | ☐ Recreation |
| ☐ Transportation/Traffic | ☐ Utilities/Service Systems |
| ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

- The proposed project does not have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

- The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, however, the potentially significant effects have been analyzed and mitigated to a point below a level of significance pursuant to a previous EIR as identified in the Environmental Checklist attached. Therefore, a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

- X The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects on the environment but revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant would avoid or mitigate the effects to below a point of significance. Therefore, a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

- The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment. There, an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

- The proposed project may have significant effect on the environment, however, a previous EIR has addressed only a portion of the effects identified as described in the Environmental Checklist discussion. As there are potentially significant effects that have not been mitigated to a below a point of significance, a **FOCUSED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** will be prepared to evaluate only those effects.

- There is no evidence that the proposed project will have the potential for adverse effects on wildlife resources and the impacts are found to be de minimis pursuant to Section 771.4 of the Fish and Game Code.

Date Prepared: June 28, 2002

Prepared By: Michael Shoberg, Community Development Director

For the following analysis, the numbers for the check boxes on the left correspond to the following:

1. Potentially Significant Impact

2. Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

3. Less than Significant Impact

4. No Impact

1. Aesthetics. Would the project:

1 2 3 4

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The General Plan identifies no scenic vistas within the vicinity of the project.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No Impact. The subject property is not along or within sight of a state highway much less a scenic highway.

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

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The perimeter walls, sidewalk, associated landscaping, and project signage facing Pierson Blvd. and Golden Eagle Way shall be subject to a separate Design Review prior to grading to assure that its impact to the surrounding neighborhood will be less than significant and that it becomes a positive addition to the city streetscape.

GEOLOGY

The site may be subject to severe ground shaking but the homes proposed to built at the site in the Specific Plan will be of wood frame construction which performs well in earthquakes. Therefore if the home plans comply with the UBC Seismic Zone 4, the affects of strong ground shaking will be less than significant.

HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

There is an existing flood control channel that runs through the site and the applicant has designed retention areas to provide mitigation for potential sheet flows reaching the project boundaries on the north side. Individual lots will be developed with on site retention and a retention area for additional flows has been designed for the southeast corner of the project.

Mitigation required. The developer will be required to improve the Pierson Boulevard frontage with a decorative wall and landscaping.

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 with Mitigation Incorporated. The developer has stated that he will provide lighting that will adequately illuminate the project to provide safety and visibility for vehicular and pedestrian movement. The Zoning Ordinance requires that all lighting shall be energy-efficient and shielded or recessed so that direct glare and reflections are contained within the boundaries of the parcel, and shall be directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public rights-of-way. No lighting shall blink, flash, or be of unusually high intensity or brightness. All lighting fixtures shall be appropriate in scale, intensity, and height to the use it is serving. Compliance with those requirements will mitigate the potential impacts of lighting from the development.

Mitigation required. Compliance with the City's outdoor lighting requirements.

2. Agricultural Resources: 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 General Plan states that there are no agricultural lands within the City limits or the sphere of influence.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act contract? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The General Plan states that there are not Williamson Act contracts within the City limits or sphere of influence and there are no zoning districts for agricultural uses.

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

No impact. Neither the subject property, surrounding properties nor any property within the City limits or sphere of influence is being used or is zoned for agricultural uses. Nothing done on the subject property will in any way impact any farmland or other agricultural use.

3. Air quality: Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures. The General Plan identifies two areas of air quality degradation. Those are ozone (O₃) and micron-size particulate matter (PM₁₀). With regard to ozone, the Coachella Valley has a history of exceeding federal ozone standards, although the number of days and months exceeding the federal standard have dropped steadily over the past decade. The General Plan, however, indicates that the federal violations are largely the result of pollutant transport from the Los Angeles/Riverside basin. Development of the property, although it would increase the amount of ozone, is insignificant as compared to the amount produced in Los Angeles and the rest of the valley.

Particulate matter is a different. Most of the particulate matter is generated and is the result of activities within the Coachella Valley, i.e. construction. The Coachella Valley Association of

Governments and the City of Desert Hot Springs has developed, and continues to monitor, those activities and ways to mitigate particulate matter impacts. Compliance with those regulations by the developer will assure adequate mitigation for particulate emissions.

Mitigation required. Compliance with local, state and federal PM₁₀ regulations.

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

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures. The issue here is the same as a) above.

Mitigation required. Compliance with local, state and federal PM₁₀ regulations.

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

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures. The issue here is the same as a) above.

Mitigation required. Compliance with local, state and federal PM₁₀ regulations.

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures. The issue here is the same as a) above.

Mitigation required. Compliance with local, state and federal PM₁₀ regulations.

- e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The development is residential only and will not create objectionable odors.

4. 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures. The Draft Coachella Valley Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan shows a small, southwest portion of TTM 30540 as potential conservation area. This plan has not been adopted therefore the applicant is not required to provide this space. Staff has not been given any reason to believe that the project will not disturb any species of special concern at the site. The High School vehicular and pedestrian traffic, noise, and lighting are likely to have scared off many of the animals and birds. However, at any time these animals could move back into the area. The milk vetch could also appear due to recent years of good springtime moisture. To assure that these species are not present at the time of grading, the applicant shall be required to have the site surveyed by a certified biologist

for potential pocket mouse, burrowing owl, and milk vetch prior to grading. If any signs of these species are found on site the applicant shall comply with the mitigation measures specified by the California Department of Fish and Game which may include relocation to an agreed upon site.

Mitigation required. The applicant shall comply with federal and state requirements for the preservation of wildlife.

- 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. There are no riparian or sensitive natural communities on the subject property.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. There are no wetlands on the property.

- 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. The Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan indicates a portion of the property along the western portion of the southern tentative tract map as a very small portion of a possible pocket mouse migration corridor and a corridor for sand transport for the fringe-toed lizard. The developer originally proposed leaving a permanent open space along the west line of the property to facilitate the corridor. Since the plan has not been adopted this portion is no longer required to be set aside by the developer. Staff believes this project will not have a significant impact on pocket mouse migration or blow sand due to the large area of similar open space still available adjacent to the project.

Mitigation required. None required.

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

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures. The General Plan calls for the City to require the preparation of wildlife surveys for new development in compliance with Federal Section 10a(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act and Section 2081 of the State Endangered Species Act. Compliance with those regulations will further insure the preservation of habitat.

Mitigation required. The applicant shall comply with federal and state requirements for the preservation of wildlife.

- 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?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less than Significant Impact. The Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan indicates a portion of the property along the western portion of the southern tentative tract map as a very small portion of a possible pocket mouse migration corridor and a corridor for sand transport for the fringe-toed lizard. The developer originally proposed leaving a permanent open space along the west line of the property to facilitate the corridor. Since the plan has not been adopted this portion is no longer required to be set aside by the developer. Staff believes this project will not have a significant impact on pocket mouse migration or blow sand due to the large area of similar open space still available adjacent to the project.

Mitigation required. None.

5. Cultural Resources: Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The General Plan states that there are no National Register listed properties or California Historic Landmarks recorded within the planning area, the existing City limits along with the City's sphere of influence. Furthermore, there are no properties listed on the California Inventory of Historic Resources.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less than Significant Impact. The General Plan indicates that the subject property is within an area of low archeological probability. If an archeological site is discovered during construction, activities should immediately stop and a qualified archaeologist needs to be brought on site to evaluate the discovery.

Mitigation required. If an archaeological site is uncovered during construction, a qualified archaeologist should be brought on site for evaluation of the discovery.

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less than Significant Impact. The General Plan indicates that the subject property is within an area of low paleontological probability. If a paleontological site is discovered during construction, activities should immediately stop and a qualified paleontologist needs to be brought on site to evaluate the discovery.

Mitigation required. If a paleontological site is uncovered during construction, a qualified paleontologist should be brought on site for evaluation of the discovery.

- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Less than Significant Impact. The General Plan indicates that the subject property is within an area of low archeological probability. If an archeological site is discovered during construction, activities should immediately stop and a qualified archaeologist needs to be brought on site to evaluate the discovery.

Mitigation required. If an archaeological site is uncovered during construction, a qualified archaeologist should be brought on site for evaluation of the discovery.

6. Geology and Soils: Would the project:

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

- i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No Impact. The "Special Studies Zone" map, shows that the vacant property is not located within any faults or seismic activity danger areas.

- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less than Significant Impact. Any building in the Desert Hot Springs area is subject to strong seismic ground shaking. The Uniform Building Code designates the entire area as Seismic Zone 4 with its associated construction standards. Compliance with that code, required by City ordinance, will assure building stability in the case of strong seismic ground shaking.

Mitigation required. All construction shall comply with the uniform building code adopted by the City of Desert Hot Springs.

- iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including Liquefaction?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The General Plan indicates that the subject property is low in the Desert Hot Springs area.

- iv) Landslides?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The General Plan states that slope instability is limited to the western and northern portion of the City, near the mountains. The subject property is not within those areas so the landslide hazard is low.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. There is no substantial topsoil on the subject property. Soil erosion can actually be lessened due to the construction and landscaping planned for the site.

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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. Other than shaking, the General Plan indicates that the Desert Hot Springs area has limited geologic hazards.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less than significant impact. The general plan indicates that wind and stream-deposited sediments are susceptible to settling. Since the subject property is in such an area, it is important that the developer perform proper excavation, compaction and foundation design to mitigate settlement potential. The Uniform Building Code contains standards and regulations that address this issue.

Mitigation required. Compliance with the Uniform Building Code requirements for excavation, compaction and foundation design.

7. Hazards and hazardous materials: Would the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The project will involve the development of a single-family, detached housing development. Although there will be the transport of some hazardous materials (e.g. gasoline) to the site during and after construction, it will not be a significant amount.

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. Again, the development of single-family residences does not significantly contribute to hazardous materials or waste.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The subject property is directly across Golden Eagle Way from the Desert Hot Springs High School but that type of development does not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials in any significant amount.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The property is not within such a site.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use

plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ <i>No impact.</i> The property is not within two miles of a public airport.
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ <i>No impact.</i> The property is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip.
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ <i>No impact.</i> The subject property, although along a major thoroughfare, is off that street and has only one access. Conflicts are therefore minimal. As far as emergency evacuation, the project will have four access point onto City streets. This should be adequate to provide emergency response and evacuation. The Fire Department will have an opportunity to review and approve the project and may attach conditions if needed.
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ <i>No impact.</i> The subject property is within an area that is being urbanized. As it develops, the Fire Department reviews the various aspects of development to insure compliance with fire codes. That should ameliorate any significant fire hazard.

8. Hydrology and water quality: Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ <i>No impact.</i> The subject property will be fully served by water and sanitary sewer from the Mission Springs Water District. All water and sanitary sewer services will be reviewed and approved by that agency. All plumbing service will be in compliance with applicable plumbing codes and reviewed and approved by the City of Desert Hot Springs. Storm drainage will be reviewed and approved by the City and the Riverside County Flood Control District to insure compliance with applicable laws.
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with ground water recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The Mission Springs Water District can serve the subject property with water.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The project will be reviewed and approved by the City and Riverside County Flood Control District for all drainage issues. The applicant's engineer has looked into the drainage situation and has suggested solutions in the narrative for the specific plan and on the tentative tract maps. Compliance with applicable laws should adequately address storm drainage.

- d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. As stated in c) above, drainage has been or will be adequately addressed through various plan review and approvals.

- e) 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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. As stated in c) above, drainage has been or will be adequately addressed through various plan review and approvals.

- f) Otherwise degrade water quality?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. As stated in c) above, drainage has been or will be adequately addressed through various plan review and approvals.

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

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures. The applicant has identified that the property is protected from flooding by the earthen dike that was constructed by Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Flood maps, however, have not been amended to reflect this. Also, a portion of the northerly tract is located in the Zone AO (depth = 3 feet, velocity = 8fps). All properties shall be designed with floor elevations above the 100 year storm event per City flood requirements.

Mitigation required. Compliance with the City's adopted flood regulations.

- h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures. The issues are the same as with g) above.

Mitigation required. Compliance with the City's adopted flood regulations.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The matter of flood control has been addressed. There should be no significant risk to people or property as a result of a dam or levee failure.

- j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. Seiche, tsunami or mudflow are the result of seismic shaking and the consequent impact on large bodies of water. There are no large bodies of water within or near the subject property.

9. Land use and planning. Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance have designated the subject property as low density residential. This allows single-family detached residences on lots of at least 9,000 square feet. The project complies with the zoning designation so it also complies with the General Plan. Since compliance with the General Plan implies furtherance of a predetermined land use pattern, the project does not divide an established community. In addition, the subject property is on vacant land that is adjacent to a great expanse of vacant land. No community exists that could be divided.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The project is in compliance with the General Plan and the proposed Specific Plan.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The only habitat conservation plan is still in a draft stage. However, the subject project does further that draft plan by designating the western portion of the southern tentative tract map as open space, wildlife preserve.

10. Mineral resources. Would the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The General Plan states that there are no mineral resources of any significance in the City's planning area.

- 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. The General Plan states that there are no mineral resources of any importance in the City's planning area.

11. Noise. Would the project:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The project is a detached, single-family residential development. That type of land use pattern is often very quiet. In fact, other than open space, it is usually the development type that is the standard for low noise.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. Except during construction, there should be little, if any, generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels from the development of detached, single-family homes.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. After construction is complete, the development should provide for a very quiet environment. There will be additional noise due to the project, but it will not be substantial.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The project will increase noise over the vacant desert. Especially during construction. However, once complete, the land uses proposed are some of the quietest among all development patterns. There should not be a substantial increase in ambient noise levels that will be detrimental to the community.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The proposed project is not within two miles of a public airport.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip,

would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

12. Population and housing. Would the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The proposal is to construct, at the maximum, 221 detached, single-family residences. Assuming they will all be built and contain the average number of people per household, 2.7 persons per dwelling, the development will add about 600 people to Desert Hot Springs. This amounts to an increase of less than four percent over the 2000 population. This is relatively insignificant and will not lead to substantial population growth.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The project is on vacant land so no existing housing will be affected.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The project is on vacant land so there will be no displacement of people.

13. Public service. Would the project:

a) 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, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following:

i) Fire Protection?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The fire station is within one mile of an existing fire station. The Fire Department will be able to serve the project.

ii) Police Protection?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The police station is within one mile of the project and can easily access the site.

Response times should be excellent and there is adequate capacity to accommodate the development.					
iii)	Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> The developer will be required to pay school fees consistent with state law. The law also states that payment of the fee is sufficient mitigation for schools.					
iv)	Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> The developer will be required to pay into the development impact fee for parks. He is also leaving about three acres as permanent open space. This should address parks and open space needs for the development.					
v)	Other Public Facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> All other public facilities, i.e. electricity, gas, telephone, cable TV and streets are available to the site in adequate capacity to serve the development.					

14. Recreation. Would the project:

a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> Adding 600 people will not substantially increase the use of existing parks.					
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> The project will not include recreational facilities but will pay into a fund to buy and build parks to serve the residents. Any development of parks will require a subsequent environmental assessment to assure no adverse impact on the environment.					

15. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:

a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections?	☐	☐	☒	☐
<i>Less than Significant Impact.</i> The General Plan indicates that Pierson Boulevard was, in 1994, at level of service (LOS) A with an average daily trip count of 5,500 trips per day. Pierson Boulevard adjacent to the project has been designated as a minor arterial. The General Plan also has a goal to have ultimate level of service of LOS C at mid-blocks and LOS D at intersections. For an arterial, the roadway capacity to attain LOS D, the street needs to carry 31,000 average daily trips. According to Trip Generation, an informational report prepared by					

the International Traffic Engineers association, single-family residences generate 10 trips per day on average. This means an additional 2,210 trips per day from the development. Assuming they all use Pierson, which will not be the case, the additional 2,210 on top of the 5,500 trips will mean an average daily trip count on Pierson of about 7,700. This is still well below the LOS A numbers contained in the General Plan. However, the developer will need to improve the interior streets and frontages along Pierson Boulevard, Golden Eagle Way and 8th Street in order to assure adequate streets.

Mitigation required. The project will need to fully improve interior streets and their proportionate share of the Pierson Boulevard, Golden Eagle Way and 8th Street as development progresses.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. This issue is the same as a) above.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. There is no public or private airport or airstrip within many miles of the subject property. There will be no safety implications from the development of the project to airports.

- d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The street system will adequately accommodate emergency access, especially when the project makes their required improvements.

- e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves, dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. All the streets serving the project have excellent vision clearance, i.e. along Pierson Boulevard. There are no unusual intersections, curves or uses within or along the frontages of the development. At any rate, the street system will have to be reviewed for adequacy by the City Engineer prior to final approvals.

- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. Since the project is nothing but single-family residences, all permits will be required to comply with parking requirements contained in the Zoning Ordinance before issuance.

16. Utilities and service systems. Would the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No impact. The Mission Springs Water District recently expanded the sewage treatment plant and should be of adequate capacity to serve the project. In addition, the developer will be

required to pay development impact fees to offset the cost of future expansions of the plant.				
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> The property will be served by existing facilities.				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> The property can be served by either existing facilities or facilities that are adequately sized and constructed to serve the property. The existing Riverside County Flood Control facility runs through the site and can be easily tied into. In addition, the project will have to be reviewed and approved by Riverside County and the City to assure compliance will all applicable laws.				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> The property will and can be served by existing water supplies.				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project" projected demand in addition to the provider" existing commitments?				
	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> The property will and can be served by existing wastewater facilities once connected to the system.				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> The existing landfill facilities are of sufficient size to accommodate the project.				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				
	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> The project is required to comply with all applicable laws.				

17. 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 animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history?	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> On the contrary, as designed, the project can further the draft Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan by designating the western portion of the southern tentative tract as permanent open space.				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> The project is a simple single-family, detached housing tract with an overall density of 2.86 dwelling units per acre, well below the five units per acre allowed by the General Plan.				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒
<i>No impact.</i> The project is a straight forward tract map for detached, single-family residences. The General Plan has anticipated that type of development on the property and designated the land as such. The proposal is therefore consistent with the General Plan and should pose no adverse impacts on people.				

References: The City of Desert Hot Springs General Plan and Environmental Impact Report, the City of Desert Hot Springs Zoning Ordinance, the Specific Plan for Eagle Pointe prepared by Hacker Engineering, the Tentative Tract Maps 30539 and 30540