MEETING AGENDA
OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, January 9, 2019
Regular Meeting: 7:00 p.m.
City of Jurupa Valley City Hall
City Council Chambers
8930 Limonite Ave., Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

REGULAR SESSION

1. 7:00 P.M. – Call to Order by the Secretary of the Planning Commission and Roll Call
   • Commissioner Mariana Lopez
   • Commissioner Corey Moore
   • Commissioner Penny Newman
   • Commissioner Arleen Pruitt
   • Commissioner Guillermo Silva

2. ANNUAL REORGANIZATION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
   2A Selection of Chair for 2019
   2B Selection of Chair Pro Tem for 2019

3. Pledge of Allegiance
4. Public Input and Approval of the Agenda

- Public Appearance / Comments
- Approval of the Agenda

5. Approval of Minutes

5.1. December 12, 2018 Meeting

6. Public Hearings

6.1 MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO.18089: CZ18001, TTM37470, VAR18004 AND EXCEPTION TO SECTION 7.10.080 (C) OF TITLE 7 TO ALLOW A RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION OF 6.74 ACRES INTO 34 SINGLE - FAMILY LOTS SOUTH OF INTERSECTION OF 30TH STREET AND SIERRA AVENUE (OR J STREET OF TTM31894) APPLICANT: JA BRAY, LLC (HIGHLAND PARK 2)

The City of Jurupa Valley has prepared and intends to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Project. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is supported by an Initial Study that evaluated potential effects and determined that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant.

RECOMMENDATION

By motion:

1) Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-01-09-01 recommending that the City Council (1) adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and (2) approve Change of Zone No. 18001, and

2) Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019 01-09-02 (1) adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; (2) approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 with an exception to Section 7.10.080 (c) of Title 7; and (3) approving Variance No. 18004 in order to allow a subdivision of 6.74 gross acres into 34 single-family lots

7. Commission Business

8. Public Appearance/Comments

9. Planning Commissioner's Reports and Comments

10. Planning Department Report
a) Pending agenda items
b) Summary of 2018 projects (information item)

11. Adjournment to the January 23, 2019 Regular Meeting
In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Government Code Section 54954.2, if you need special assistance to participate in a meeting of the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission, please call 951-332-6464. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or time when services are needed will assist staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting or service.

Agendas of public meetings and any other writings distributed to all, or a majority of, the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission in connection with a matter subject to discussion or consideration at an open meeting of the Planning Commission are public records. If such writing is distributed less than 72 hours prior to a public meeting, the writing will be made available for public inspection at the City of Jurupa Valley, 8930 Limonite Ave., Jurupa Valley, CA 92509, at the time the writing is distributed to all, or a majority of, the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission. The Planning Commission may also post the writing on its Internet website at www.jurupavalley.org.
DATE: JANUARY 9, 2019

TO: MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 2.0

ANNUAL REORGANIZATION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

2A Selection of Chair for 2019
2B Selection of Chair Pro Tem for 2019

BACKGROUND

Rules of Procedures

The Planning Commission Rules of Procedures provides the following requirement for the annual reorganization:

C. Selection of Planning Commission Officers. At the last regular Planning Commission Meeting in December of each year, the Planning Commission shall select from among its members a Chair and Chair Pro Tempore to serve for the following year. The Chair and Chair Pro Tempore shall take office on January 1 of each year. The term of office for the Chair and the Chair Pro Tempore shall be a calendar year from January 1 through December 31.

D. Waiver of Rules. The Planning Commission shall have the authority to waive provisions of the procedures established by this policy unless the procedure is required. Failure of the Planning Commission to follow these procedures shall not invalidate or otherwise affect any action of the Planning Commission.

Inasmuch as the last regular meeting on December 26, 2018 was canceled, it is appropriate for the Commission to reorganize at the January 9, 2019 meeting. The Commission should waive the rule and proceed with the reorganization on this date.

Acting Chair

In November 2018 Chair Hofferber resigned from the Commission due to a change in residency. Chair Pro Tem Ruiz chaired the Commission meetings for the remainder of 2018 until his term ended in December. As of the January 9th meeting, the Commission has no one serving as Chair or Chair Pro Tem. In order to proceed with the selection of the Chair, the Secretary of the Planning Commission (Planning Director) will act as Chair to call the meeting to order and moderate the meeting until the voting members select a Chair as the first item of business.
PROCEDURE

Item 2A: Selection of the Chair for 2019. The procedure will be as follows:

1. Secretary of the Commission (Planning Director) will act as the Chair during the selection of the Chair for 2019.
2. The Secretary will ask for a motion and a second to waive the rule for reorganizing the Commission at the last meeting of December and select a Chair and Chair Pro Tem on January 9, 2019.
3. The Secretary will call for nominations for the office of Chair for 2019. Each nomination will be noted by the chair pro tem. A nomination does not require a second.
4. When no further nominations are evident, the Secretary will ask for a motion and a second to close nominations.
5. Upon a majority vote to close nominations, the Secretary will ask for a motion and a second to select a nominee for the office of Chair.
6. Upon a majority vote on a motion to select a Chair, the Secretary will relinquish the gavel to the newly selected Chair.

Item 1B. Selection of the Chair Pro Tem for 2019. The newly selected Chair will follow the same procedure outlined above for the selection of a Chair Pro Tem for 2019.

Submitted by:

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

Reviewed by:

//s// Serita Young

Serita Young
Assistant City Attorney
1. Call to Order and Roll Call
The Regular Session of the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:15 p.m. on December 12, 2018 at the City Council Chambers, 8930 Limonite Ave., Jurupa Valley.

Members present:
• George Ruiz, Chair Pro Tem
• Corey Moore, Commission Member
• Arleen Pruitt, Commission Member
• Guillermo Silva, Commission Member

Members absent: All Present

2. Pledge of Allegiance – Commissioner Pruitt

3. Public Appearance/Comments - None

4. Approval of Agenda
Commissioner Silva moved, and Commissioner Moore seconded, a motion to approve the 12-12-2018 agenda. The motion was approved 4:0.

Ayes: Ruiz, Moore, Pruitt, Silva
Noes: None
Abstained: None
Absent: None

5. Approval of Minutes
Commissioner Silva moved and Commissioner Moore seconded, a motion to approve the November 28, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes. The motion was approved 4:0.

Ayes: Ruiz, Moore, Pruitt, Silva
Noes: None
Abstained: None
Absent: None
6. Public Hearings

6.1 MASTER APPLICATION NO. 18113: SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 18052 (SDP18052) TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A 7,360 SQUARE-FOOT AUTO PARTS AND SUPPLIES RETAIL STORE WITH SITE IMPROVEMENTS ON A VACANT LOT LOCATED AT 9056 MISSION BLVD. (APN:169-120-036)

Mr. Roberto Gonzalez, Associate Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation with an overview of the project and noted the project had come to the Commission as a Study Session at the June 13, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting. At that time, the Commissioners expressed concerns with the site plan and the ability to make necessary finding pertaining to the development of the adjoining property. In particular, staff and the Commission did not support the use of the adjoining lot to fulfil parking needs since it could impede future development. In addition, the Commissioners discussed the General Plan Overlay for the future Glen Avon Town Center Master Plan. Also at the July Study Session, the PC directed the applicant to work with staff to address these concerns. Mr. Gonzales noted he has worked with the applicant to address architectural concerns however; the concerns with parking and the access easement on the adjoining property have remained a concern.

Planning Director Mr. Tom Merrell clarified various items addressed by Mr. Gonzalez to be included in the Conditions of Approval.

Ms. Becky Dansker, Applicant representative, provided a presentation and thanked city staff for working on this project.

Mr. Luke Corsbie, Engineering Consultant representative discussed configuration of the site.

Mr. Joe Arce, Auto Zone Representative, thanked the Commissioners and looks forward to having another Auto Zone in Jurupa Valley.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Mr. Joe Manzano, Resident stated he is in support of the proposed project.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

There being no other persons wishing to address the Commission, Chair Pro Tem Ruiz closed the public hearing.

COMMISSIONERS DELIBERATION:

Members of the Commission discussed the following issues:

1. Front Entrance Design
2. Drainage Concern
3. Employee Training
4. Garage Restriction Discussion
5. Shared Parking Consideration
6. Site Development Permit to be submitted for Planning Commission Approval for adjacent site
7. Conditions of Approval to be revised and clarified by Assistant City Attorney

PUBLIC HEARING REOPENED

Chair Ruiz reopened the hearing to allow the applicant to comment on the issues under discussion.
Ms. Becky Dansker, Applicant representative, stated they are in the process of acquiring the property on the east side.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

There being no other persons wishing to address the Commission, Chair Pro Tem Ruiz closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Moore moved and Commissioner Pruitt seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2018-12-12-01 subject to the revised Conditions of Approval. The motion was approved 4:0.

- **Ayes:** Ruiz, Pruitt, Silva, Moore
- **Noes:** None
- **Abstained:** None
- **Absent:** None

7. **Commission Business – None**

8. **Public Appearance/Comments – None**

9. **Planning Commissioner’s Reports and Comments – None**

10. **Planning Department Report**

Planning Director Tom Merrell discussed the pending Council confirmation of Commission appointments and noted there will be workshops scheduled for the Commissioners to provide input on major projects prior to public hearings. Mr. Merrell discussed the calendar for the upcoming months.

There being no further business before the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission, Chair Pro Tem Ruiz adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m. to the January 9, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director
Secretary of the Planning Commission
DATE: JANUARY 9, 2019
TO: MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: ANNETTE TAM, SENIOR PLANNER
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.1
MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18089: CZ18001, TTM37470, VAR18004
AND EXCEPTION TO SECTION 7.10.080 (C) OF TITLE 7
PROPOSAL: “HIGHLAND PARK 2” – RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION OF 6.74
ACRES INTO 34 SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS
LOCATION: SOUTH OF INTERSECTION OF 30TH STREET AND SIERRA
AVENUE (OR J STREET OF TTM31894)
APPLICANT: JA BRAY, LLC

RECOMMENDATION

By motion:

1. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-01-09-01, recommending that the City
Council (1) adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and
Reporting Program and (2) approve Change of Zone No. 18001; and

2. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-01-09-02, (1) adopting a Mitigated
Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; (2) approving
Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 with an exception to Section 7.10.080 (c) of Title 7; and
(3) approving Variance No. 18004 in order to allow a subdivision of 6.74 gross acres into
34 single-family lots.

BACKGROUND

Project Description & Location: Highland Park 2. The proposed project is for a 34-single-
family lot subdivision on approximately 6.74 acres. The average lot size for this project is 6,400
square-feet. It is located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue in the
Sunnyslope area. See Exhibit A for the project location. Project location is indicated with a star.

The land was originally intended to be made a part of the original Highland Park 1 application
that was approved by the City Council in 2016. However, the applicant and the previous owner,
County of Riverside, did not come to an agreement on the land acquisition until after the
Highland Park 1 approval. Thus, the applicant made a separate application for this 34-single-
family lot subdivision. Highland Park 2 (34 units) adds about 8% to Highland Park 1 (398 units).
See Exhibit B for approved Highland Park 1 project.
The applicant intends for both projects to be developed similar in character and quality including architectural styles, and floor plans. Highland Park 2 cannot request to change the zoning to R-4 (same zoning as Highland Park 1) due to a code requirement that requires the project area to be at least 9 acres. Highland Park 2 is 6.74 acres. Thus, the request is for an R-1 zone.

Had the project been included with the original Highland Park application, the project site could have been zoned R-4. Thus, if the project had been zoned R-4, all the lots would comply with the R-4 development standards. It is only a technicality that the project cannot be zoned R-4.

The project site abuts the western boundary of Highland Park 1. Exhibit C presents the location of “Highland Park 1” in yellow color and indicates the location of “Highland Park 2” with a star.

EXHIBIT A. PROJECT SITE (SOURCE: COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE GIS)

Table 1 presents the applications for this project. Per the Municipal code, the Planning Commission is the advisory agency for Schedule “A” tentative maps and Variances. Thus, the Planning Commission takes action on both of the Tentative Tract Map (TTM) with exception and Variance applications for this project. A condition of the TTM will state that the approval of the TTM and VAR will not take effect unless the Change of Zone is approved and effective. For a Change of Zone (CZ) application, the Planning Commission holds a public hearing and makes a recommendation to the City Council. If the Commission recommends approval of the CZ, the City Council will hold a hearing and takes action on the CZ application. If the Commission
recommends denial of the CZ, the Commission’s recommendation is considered final and the City Council does not take action unless the Commission’s decision is appealed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change of Zone (CZ)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tentative Tract Map (TTM) with Exception to Section 7.10.080 (c) of Title 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance (VAR)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESSION’S PARCEL NUMBER(S)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ACREAGE OF PROJECT SITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background of Highland Park 1.** In March 2016, the City Council approved a residential subdivision for 398 single-family homes with a community park on 168 acres of land in the Sunnyslope community. The residential subdivision is named Highland Park and it is surrounded by residential communities. Highland Park 1 has an average lot size of 6,550 square-feet for a total of 398 single-family homes. Highland Park 2 has an average lot size of 6,400 square-feet.

It is located north of Canal Street, east of Sierra Avenue / 20th Street, and north of the Union Pacific Railroad line. Refer to Exhibit C for location.

Highland Park 1 includes an abandoned quarry located adjacent to the homes and community. The land use designation and zoning were for industrial use and mining. Since Highland Park was approved, the Medium Density Residential land use designation and R-4 (Planned Residential) zone are for residential use.

R-4 zone allows for both (1) a minimum lot area of 3,600 square-feet and (2) a minimum of 6,000 square-feet overall per dwelling unit that includes recreation and service areas. The zone
is intended for smaller lots with a greater area of shared common recreation and open space or a conventional single-family neighborhood with 6,000 square-feet lots.

2017 General Plan. As part of the adoption of the 2017 General Plan, the City Council approved the project site for Highland Park 2 to have a land use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) which was recommended by staff in anticipation of this application. The surrounding area has the same land use designation of MDR. MDR allows up to 5 units per acre. See Exhibit D for the land use map which shows the general area designated as MDR.

EXHIBIT B. APPROVED HIGHLAND PARK 1 PROJECT (398 UNITS)
ANALYSIS

I. PROJECT DESIGN & MAINTENANCE.

A. Project Design Overall. The proposed project is within a residential area. There is an existing residential community on the north side of 30th Street (across the street to the north) and a recently approved 400-unit residential community, “Highland Park,” which abuts the proposed tract on the east boundary line.

The proposed project has thirty-four single-family lots that fronts onto Street A. See Exhibit E, Conceptual Landscape Plans, below. The single-family lots are surrounded by open space areas, including water quality basins, to the west by Lot 36, south by Lot 35, and east by Highland Park 1 tract. Additionally, there is will be an eight foot (8’) wide D.G. multi-purpose trail that starts on 30th Street and ends at the south boundary abutting the Union Pacific Railroad. The trail would connect to the Highland Park 1 trail.

EXHIBIT E. CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLANS

B. Circulation.

• Street A is an extension of the existing Sierra Avenue to the north of 30th Street. See Exhibit F for the cross-section. It is designed to be 56-foot-wide with a 10-foot-wide parkway on both sides of the street. A five-foot-wide landscaped area will be constructed between the street and the sidewalk. It will serve as a buffer for the pedestrians from the street. The street trees will enhance the street scene in the tract.

EXHIBIT F. CROSS-SECTION OF STREET A
• 30th Street will be widened to be constructed as a sixty-six-foot-wide right-of-way. See Exhibit G for the cross-section. The south side of 30th Street will be constructed to have a sidewalk and landscaped area along the project frontage. The landscaped area will be adjacent to the street to serve as a buffer for pedestrians, too.

The easterly end of 30th Street, beyond Sierra Avenue, is proposed to be vacated to be a part of Lot 1. Engineering Department has no objection since the area east of Sierra Avenue will not be needed.

**EXHIBIT G. CROSS-SECTION OF 30TH STREET**

C. Architecture & Floor Plans. The approval for Highland Park 1 includes approved conceptual architectural styles and floor plans. The styles include Craftsman, Cottage, Spanish, and Traditional.

A condition for this project will require the architectural styles and floor plans for the homes to be substantially in conformance with the approved Highland Park 1’s approved architectural styles and floor plans.

D. Walls & Fences. The proposed walls and fences match the approved Highland Park 1 project. A six-foot high split-face wall is proposed for the rear lot lines and lot lines that abut 30th Street and the water quality basin. An almost six-foot high vinyl fence is proposed for the side lot lines with a matching vinyl gate for the side yard. A black tubular steel fence with split-face block pilaster is proposed to secure the water quality basin.

E. Maintenance of Project. Table 5, Maintenance, presents a summary of the maintenance information.

A condition of approval will require the recordation of Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions (CC & Rs) and the formation of a Homeowner’s Association (HOA). The plan is to have one HOA for both Highland Park 1 and 2.

Community Facilities District (CFD) or Lighting & Landscape Maintenance District (L&LMD) is required to be formed for the maintenance of the water quality basin and trees in the public rights-of-way.
TABLE 5. MAINTENANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM FOR MAINTENANCE</th>
<th>MAINTENANCE AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Landscaped Parkways on Street “A” except trees</td>
<td>Private Homeowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Abutting Walls &amp; Fences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Common Open Area with all improvements and landscaping</td>
<td>Homeowner’s Association (HOA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Abutting Walls &amp; Fences along common areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trees in the Rights-of-Way</td>
<td>Community Facilities District (CFD) or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting &amp; Landscape Maintenance District (LLMD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water Quality Basin</td>
<td>Community Facilities District (CFD) or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting &amp; Landscape Maintenance District (LLMD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-purpose Trail within Lots 35 &amp; 36</td>
<td>Jurupa Area Recreation &amp; Park District (JARPD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT. The City of Jurupa Valley has prepared and intends to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Project. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is supported by an Initial Study that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forest Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration determines that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. The City’s decision to prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration should not be construed as a recommendation of either approval or denial of this Project. Planning Condition No. 4 requires all the mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to be as conditions.

Public Review Period. The public review period for the environmental document began on November 20, 2018 and ended on December 19, 2018. The City did not receive any comment.

III. GENERAL PLAN. The proposed project is consistent with the recently adopted General Plan. The project meets the intent, characteristics and policies of the land use designation.

The proposed zoning classification of R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) is consistent with Medium Density Residential (MDR). MDR is for single-family detached and
attached residential and allows up to 5 dwelling units per acre. This project is for single-family detached and the project’s density is 5 dwelling units per acre.

MDR’s typical lot size ranges from 5,500 square-feet to 20,000 square-feet. The project’s average lot size is almost 6,400 square-feet with one lot under 6,000 square-feet and a several lots greater than 7,200 square-feet.

IV. TILE 9 LAND USE ORDINANCE. The project is consistent with the proposed R-1 zone (One (1) Family Dwellings) with an approved Variance. See Table 3 for a summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Does The Project Comply?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area: Minimum 7,200 square-feet</td>
<td>Yes – with an approved Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Width of Lot: Minimum 60 ft.</td>
<td>Yes – with an approved Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Depth of Lot: Minimum 100 ft.</td>
<td>Yes, as shown on the TTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Frontage:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimum 60 ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lots fronting on knuckles or cul-de-sac may have a min. of 35 ft.</td>
<td>Yes – with an approved Variance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance for Lot Area. Most of the lots (91%) require a variance to allow the lot area to be less than the required minimum lot area of 7,200 square-feet. The average lot size is almost 6,400 square-feet. The proposed lots are smaller than the required minimum lot area by 5.6% - 20.6% with an average of 13%. Only one lot is less than 6,000 square-feet at 5,711 square-feet.

The characteristics of this neighborhood will be very similar to the existing neighborhoods especially from the street. The setbacks are the same. The size of the homes is generally the same. The only difference is a slightly larger backyard that is not visible from the street. In other words, it is not possible to visually determine whether a neighborhood has 6,000 square-feet lots or 7,200 square-feet lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT NO.</th>
<th>LOT AREA (SF)</th>
<th>LOT NO.</th>
<th>LOT AREA (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>6,792 (5.6% var)</td>
<td>Lot 19</td>
<td>5,711 (20.6% var)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>6,486 (10.0% var)</td>
<td>Lot 20</td>
<td>6,026 (16.3% var)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>6,250 (13.1% var)</td>
<td>Lot 21</td>
<td>6,110 (15.1% var)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6 – 14, 22 – 29, &amp; 30</td>
<td>6,246 (13.2% var)</td>
<td>Lot 31</td>
<td>6,549 (9.0% var)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 15</td>
<td>6,096 (15.3% var)</td>
<td>Lot 32</td>
<td>6,335 (12.0% var)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 17</td>
<td>6,045 (16.0% var)</td>
<td>Lot 33</td>
<td>6,108 (15.1% var)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 18</td>
<td>6,659 (7.5% var)</td>
<td>Lot 34</td>
<td>6,363 (11.6% var)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variance for Average Lot Width. The project requests a variance to modify the average lot width from 60 feet to 50 feet (16% decrease in lot width) for 33 lots (91%). The average lot width for the tract is 50 feet with a few lots greater than 50 feet.

Variance for Minimum Lot Frontage. The project requests a variance to modify the minimum lot frontage of 60 feet. Twenty-nine lots have a lot frontage between 50 feet to 53 feet. These lot frontages are smaller than the required minimum lot frontage by 11.6% to 16.6%. All the lots that front the cul-de-sac meet the minimum lot frontage of 35 feet.

V. TITLE 7 SUBDIVISIONS. The tentative tract map, Schedule “A”, complies with the all applicable provisions of Title 7 and the Subdivision Map Act for standards and process with the exception to Section 7.10.080 (C).

The exception would allow five (5) lots, Lots 1 – 4 and 18, to have lot depth greater than 2.5 times than the lot width by, at most, 20%. The lot ratios of those five lots range between 2.55 to 3.18.

These lots have a greater lot depth due to the design of the internal street (Street A) which is an extension of the existing Sierra Avenue. The slightly curved angle of Street A along these lots causes the lot depth to be greater than the lots along the straight portion of Street A. Additionally, the existing irregular shape of the southern boundary combined with the cul-de-sac, causes Lot 18 to have a greater lot depth. However, the lot ratio of these lots is generally within 20% of the maximum. The granting of the exception to have a great lot depth than the maximum will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare or be damaging to other property in the vicinity. The slightly larger lot depth will provide more yard space.

Engineering Department has reviewed the project for access, circulation, grading, and drainage. Staff is recommending the attached conditions which address areas such as subdivision, circulation, access, grading, drainage, and water quality.

VI. FINDINGS FOR TENTATIVE LAND DIVISION MAPS (SECTION 7.15.180 OF TITLE 7)

“A tentative map shall be denied if it does not meet all requirements of this ordinance, or if any of the following findings are made:

A. That the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

The project is consistent with the general plan with the approved Change of Zone and Variance. The land use designation is Medium Density Residential and the land is suitable for the proposed residential land division of 6.74 acres and density.

B. That the design or improvement of the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

The proposed design of the subdivision with improvements is consistent with the General Plan including the characteristics and allowed density of MDR.

C. That the site of the proposed land division is not physically suitable for the type of development.
The site is physically suitable for the development as designed.

D. That the site of the proposed land division is not physically suitable for the proposed density of the development.

The site with the design is suitable for the proposed density.

E. That the design of the proposed land division or proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

The project will not cause any substantial environmental damage or impacts to wildlife and their habitats with recommended conditions and mitigation measures. Staff prepared an Initial Study and intends to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The document is attached to this staff report. The project will not be a danger to the welfare of the general public. The project will not cause serious public health problems.

F. That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements are likely to cause serious public health problems.

G. That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division. A land division may be approved if it is found that alternative easements for access or for use will be provided and that they will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public. This subsection shall apply only to easements of record or to easements established by judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction.

The project does not have any easement for access, acquired by the public at large, through or use of the property within the subdivision.

H. Notwithstanding subsection E. above, a tentative map may be approved if an environmental impact report was prepared with respect to the project and a finding was made, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

Staff prepared an Initial Study and intends to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The document is attached to this staff report.

VII. FINDINGS FOR GRANTING A VARIANCE (SEC. 9.240.270 OF TITLE 9).

"Variances from the terms of this chapter may be granted when, because special circumstances applicable to a parcel of property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of this chapter deprive such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity that is under the same zoning classification."

The above findings can be made to support a recommendation for granting a variance to permit the minimum (1) average lot width be less than 60 feet; (2) lot frontage to be less than 60 feet; and (3) the lot area to be less than 7,200 square-feet.
The strict application of these three development standards deprive the subject parcel of property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity under the same R-1 zoning classification that have lot areas less than 7,200 square-feet.

This project is designed to be similar in character and aesthetics as the previously approved Highland Park1 which abuts the project site. In order for this project to be designed consistent with the character of Highland Park 1, the Variance must be approved.

This project meets the intent of the code and is consistent with the General Plan. The proposed zoning classification of R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) is consistent with Medium Density Residential (MDR). MDR is for single-family detached and attached residential and allows up to 5 dwelling units per acre. This project is for single-family detached and the project’s density is 5 dwelling units per acre. MDR’s typical lot size ranges from 5,500 square-feet to 20,000 square-feet. The project’s average lot size is almost 6,400 square-feet.

CONCLUSION

This project is designed to be a part of the Highland Park 1 community that the City Council approved. The character and aesthetics of both tracts will be the same as this project will have the same architecture and floor plans. Moreover, the lot design is similar. The average lot size for Highland Park 1 is 6,550 square-feet and Highland Park 2 is 6,400 square-feet. The project is small since it adds only 8% to the overall Highland Park project.

For these reasons, the staff recommends approval of the project.
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ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Resolution No. 2019-01-09-01
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-01-09-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM AND APPROVE CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 18001 TO CHANGE THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 6.74 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF 30TH STREET AND SIERRA AVENUE (APNS: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) FROM RURAL RESIDENTIAL (R-R) ZONE TO ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Project. JA Bray, LLC (the “Applicant”) has applied for Change of Zone No. 18001, Variance No. 18004, and an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 (collectively, Master Application No. 18089 or MA No. 18089) to change the classification of real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone, and to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots on real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) (the “Project”). Change of Zone No. 18001 is the subject of this Resolution.

Section 2. Change of Zone.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Change of Zone No. 18001 to rezone 6.74 gross acres located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone.

(b) Section 9.285.020.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the owner of real property, or a person authorized by the owner, may request that the City consider a change in the zoning classification that has been applied to the owner’s property.

(c) Section 9.285.020.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that applications for change of zone must be made to the Planning Commission on forms provided by the Planning Department, must supply all required information, and must be accompanied by the filing fee set forth in Chapter 3.65.
(d) Section 9.285.020.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that an application for a change of zone may not be set for a public hearing until (1) all procedures required by the Jurupa Valley Rules Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) to hear a matter have been completed; and (2) the requested change of zone is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan.

(e) Sections 9.285.040.(1) and (2) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that the Planning Commission shall hold a noticed public hearing on a proposed amendment to Title 9 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code that proposes to change property from one zone to another.

(f) Section 9.285.040.(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that, after closing the public hearing, the Planning Commission must render its decision within a reasonable time and transmit it to the City Council in the form of a written recommendation, which shall contain the reasons for the recommendation and the relationship of the proposed amendment to 2017 General Plan. A copy of the Planning Commission’s recommendation must be mailed to the applicant and proof thereof must be shown on the original transmitted to the City Council. If the Planning Commission does not reach a decision due to a tie vote, that fact must be reported to the City Council and the failure to reach a decision shall be deemed a recommendation against the proposed change of zone.

Section 3. Procedural Findings. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) The application for MA No. 18089 was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On January 9, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 18089, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.

(c) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

Section 4. California Environmental Quality Act Findings and Recommendation for Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby recommends that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley make the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §21000 et seq.) and the State Guidelines (the “Guidelines”) (14 Cal. Code Regs. §15000 et seq.), City staff prepared an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of the approval of the Project as described in the Initial Study. Based upon the findings contained in that Study, City staff determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there was no substantial evidence that the Project could have a significant effect on the environment and a
Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) was prepared by the City in full compliance with CEQA.

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced on November 20, 2018, and expired on December 19, 2018. Copies of the documents have been available for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509. The City received did not receive any comments during the public review period.

(c) The City Council has reviewed the MND and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”), attached as Exhibit “_” and all comments received regarding the MND and, based on the whole record before it, finds that:

1) The MND was prepared in compliance with CEQA;
2) With the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment; and
3) The MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City Council.

(d) Based on the findings set forth in this Resolution, the City Council hereby adopts the MND and MMRP for the Project.

(e) The Planning Director is authorized and directed to file a Notice of Determination in accordance with CEQA.

Section 5. **Findings for Recommendation of Approval of Change of Zone.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby recommend that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley find and determine that Change of Zone No. 18001 should be adopted because the proposed change of zoning classification from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and the requirements of the General Plan land use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR). The General Plan land use designation of MDR permits single-family detached and attached residential and allows up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The Project proposes single-family detached and a density of five (5) dwelling units per acre. The General Plan land use designation of MDR permits lot ranges from 5,500 square-feet to 20,000 square-feet. The proposed Project’s average lot size is almost 6,400 square-feet, with one lot under 6,000 square-feet and a several lots greater than 7,200 square-feet.

Section 6. **Recommendation of Approval of Change of Zone No. 18001.** Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby recommends that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley approve Change of Zone No. 18001 to rezone 6.74 gross acres located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone.
Section 7. **Certification.** The Planning Director shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED** by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 9th day of January, 2019.

__________________________________________
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director/Secretary to the Planning Commission
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

I, Thomas G. Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-01-09-01 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 9th day of January, 2019, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP
PLANNING DIRECTOR
ATTACHMENT NO. 2

Resolution No. 2019-01-09-02
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-01-09-02


THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Project. JA Bray, LLC (the “Applicant”) has applied for Change of Zone No. 18001, Variance No. 18004, and an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 (collectively, Master Application No. 18089 or MA No. 18089) to change the classification of real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone, and to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots on real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) (the “Project”). Variance No. 18004, the exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 are the subject of this Resolution.

Section 2. Variance.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Variance No. 18004 from: (1) the minimum lot area of 7,200 square feet for premises in the R-1 Zone, as set forth in Section 9.55.020.(2) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, to permit lot areas ranging between 5,711 and 6,792 square feet for Lots 3-15 and 17-34, (2) the minimum average lot width of sixty (60) feet for premises in the R-1 Zone, as set forth in Section 9.55.020.(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, to permit an average lot width of fifty (50) feet for Lots 1-15 and 17 - 34, and (3) the minimum lot frontage of sixty (60) feet for premises in the R-1 Zone, as set forth in Section 9.55.020.(4) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, to permit lot frontages ranging between 50 and 53 feet for Lots 1 – 15 and 21 – 34.

(b) Section 9.240.270.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that variances from the terms of Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, may be granted when, because of special circumstances applicable to a parcel of property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of Title 9
deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity that is under the same zoning classification. A variance may not be granted for a parcel of property that authorizes a use or activity that is not otherwise expressly authorized by the zone regulation governing the parcel of property, but must be limited to modifications of property development standards, such as lot size, lot coverage, yards, and parking and landscape requirements.

(c) Section 9.240.270.D. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that any variance granted shall be subject to such conditions as are necessary so that the adjustment does not constitute a grant of special privileges that is inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which the property is situated, and which are necessary to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the community.

(d) Section 9.240.270.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that all public hearings on variances that require approval of a land division shall be heard by the hearing body that has jurisdiction of the principal application.

(e) Section 9.240.270.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code further provides that a public hearing shall be held on all variance applications in accordance with the provisions of Section 9.240.250, and all the procedural requirements and rights of appeal as set forth therein shall govern the hearing.

(f) Section 9.240.250.(6) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that for any decision where the hearing body is the Planning Commission and it has rendered a final decision rather than a recommendation to the City Council, that decision shall be considered final unless an appeal is filed with the City Clerk within ten (10) days after the decision. An appeal may be filed by the applicant, any interested person, or an individual Council Member or by a majority vote of the Council. If an appeal is filed by an applicant or other interested person, it shall be accompanied by the fee set forth in County Ordinance No. 671. Any appeal filed by an individual Council Member or by a majority vote of the Council does not require the payment of a fee. After an appeal is filed and the fee is received by the city, the City Clerk shall set the matter for public hearing before the City Council not less than thirteen (13) nor more than sixty (60) days thereafter and shall give notice of the time and place of the hearing in the same manner as notice was given of the hearing before the Planning Commission.

(g) Section 9.240.250.(7) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the City Council shall hear the matter de novo; however, the documents and the minutes of the hearing before the hearing body shall be a part of the City Council’s record at its hearing on the matter. The City Council shall hear relevant testimony from interested persons and within a reasonable time after the close of the hearing, make its decision sustaining, reversing or modifying the decision of the hearing body.

Section 3. Exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(a) Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code states, in part: “When lots eighteen thousand (18,000) square feet or less are proposed, the depth of lots shall not exceed two and one-half (2½) times the width.”
(b) The Applicant is seeking approval of an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code for the depth of Lots 1-4 and 18 in the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 to exceed 2½ times the width.

(c) Section 7.10.010.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code states that “[e]xceptions from the requirements of this title relating to the design or improvement of land divisions shall be granted by the appropriate advisory agency or appeal board only when it is determined that there are special circumstances applicable to the property, such as but not limited to size, shape or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, and that the granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare or be damaging to other property in the vicinity.”

Section 4. Tentative Tract Map.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37470, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots on real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005).

(b) Section 7.05.020.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission is designated as the “Advisory Agency” charged with the duty of making investigations and reports on the design and improvement of all proposed Schedule “A” maps. Further, Sections 7.05.020.A. and 7.15.150 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that the Planning Commission is authorized to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove all such tentative map land divisions and report the action directly to the City Council and the land divider.

(c) Section 7.15.130.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that within fifty (50) days after the date of filing of a commercial parcel map, a public hearing on the map must be held before the Planning Commission. Section 7.15.130.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after the close of the hearing, the Planning Commission must approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove the proposed tentative map, file notice of the decision with the City Clerk, and mail notice of the decision to the land divider, or his or her authorized agent, and any interested party requesting a copy.

(d) Section 7.15.180 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code requires denial of a tentative tract map if it does not meet all of the requirements of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, or if any of the following findings are made:

1) That the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

2) That the design or improvement of the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

3) That the site of the proposed land division is not physically suitable for the type of development.
4) That the site of the proposed land division is not physically suitable for the proposed density of the development.

5) That the design of the proposed land division or proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

6) That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements are likely to cause serious public health problems.

7) That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division. A land division may be approved if it is found that alternate easements for access or for use will be provided and that they will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public. This subsection shall apply only to easements of record or to easements established by judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction.

8) Notwithstanding subsection 5) above, a tentative map may be approved if an environmental impact report was prepared with respect to the project and a finding was made, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

(e) Section 7.15.140 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the action of the Planning Commission on a tentative Schedule “A” map will be final, unless the final decision is appealed by the land divider or any interested party.

(f) Sections 7.05.030.B. and 7.15.150 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that if a land divider or any interested party believes that they may be adversely affected by the decision of the Planning Commission, the land divider or any interested party may appeal the decision to the City Council. Any such appeal shall be filed with the City Clerk within ten (10) days after the notice of decision of the Planning Commission appears on the City Council’s agenda. The appeal must be filed in writing, stating the basis for appeal, and must be accompanied by the applicable fee.

Section 5. Procedural Findings. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) The application for MA No. 18089 was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On January 9, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 18089, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.
(c) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

Section 6. **California Environmental Quality Act Findings for Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby make the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §21000 et seq.) and the State Guidelines (the “Guidelines”) (14 Cal. Code Regs. §15000 et seq.), City staff prepared an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of the approval of the Project as described in the Initial Study. Based upon the findings contained in that Study, City staff determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there was no substantial evidence that the Project could have a significant effect on the environment and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) was prepared by the City in full compliance with CEQA.

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced on November 20, 2018, and expired on December 19, 2018. Copies of the documents have been available for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509. The City received did not receive any comments during the public review period.

(c) The Planning Commission has reviewed the MND and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”), attached as Exhibit “B,” and all comments received regarding the MND and, based on the whole record before it, finds that:

1) The MND was prepared in compliance with CEQA;

2) With the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment; and

3) The MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission.

(d) Based on the findings set forth in this Resolution, the Planning Commission hereby adopts the MND and MMRP for the Project.

(e) The Planning Director is authorized and directed to file a Notice of Determination in accordance with CEQA.

Section 7. **Findings for Approval of Variance.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the proposed Variance No. 18004 should be granted because:

(a) Special circumstances apply to the subject parcel of property, including existing irregularly shaped lots, and the strict application of the minimum lot area, average lot width, and lot frontage requirements under Sections 9.55.020.(2), (3), and (4) of the Jurupa
Valley Municipal Code will deprive the subject parcel of property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity under the same R-1 zoning classification that have lot areas less than 7,200 square feet.

(b) The adjustment does not constitute a grant of special privileges that is inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and the R-1 Zone, which have lot areas less than 7,200 square feet, and will not be detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of the community because the proposed Project meets the intent of the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan.

Section 8. Findings for Approval of Exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the City of Jurupa Valley should be granted because:

(a) There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property, such as, but not limited to, size, shape or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, in that these lots have a greater lot depth due to the design of the internal street (Street A) which is an extension of the existing Sierra Avenue. The slightly curved angle of Street A along these lots causes the lot depth to be greater than the lots along the straight portion of Street A. Additionally, the existing irregular shape of the southern boundary combined with the cul-de-sac, causes Lot 18 to have a greater lot depth.

(b) The granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or be damaging to other property in the vicinity, in that allowance of slightly greater lot depth will increase the backyard area which is used by the residents.

Section 9. Findings for Approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37470. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed land division will be consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan upon approval of Change of Zone No. 18001 and Variance No. 18004, in that the land use designation of MDR and the subject property are suitable for the proposed residential land division of 6.74 acres and the proposed density.

(b) The design and improvement of the proposed land division is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan, including the characteristics and allowed density of premises designated MDR.

(c) The site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the type of development as designed.

(d) The site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development.

(e) The design of the proposed land division and proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or
wildlife or their habitat with the imposition of the recommended conditions of approval and mitigation measures.

(f) The design of the proposed land division and the type of improvements are not likely to cause serious public health problems. The Project will not be a danger to the welfare of the general public.

(g) The subject property does not have any easements, acquired by the public at large, for either access through, or use of, the subject property within the proposed land division.

Section 10. Approval of Variance, Exception, and Tentative Tract Map with Conditions. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission hereby approves Variance No. 18004, an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots on real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005), subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “A.” The Planning Commission’s approval of Variance No. 18004, the exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 is conditioned upon the City Council’s adoption of an ordinance approving Change of Zone No. 18001, and this approval shall not take effect until the effective date of the ordinance approving Change of Zone No. 18001.

Section 11. Certification. The Planning Director shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 9th day of January, 2019.

______________________________
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission

ATTEST:

______________________________
Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director/Secretary to the Planning Commission
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  ) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY  )

I, Thomas Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-01-09-02 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 9th day of January, 2019, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:  COMMISSION MEMBERS:

NOES:  COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT:  COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN:  COMMISSION MEMBERS:

______________________________
THOMAS G. MERRELL
PLANNING DIRECTOR
EXHIBIT A OF ATTACHMENT NO. 2

Recommended Conditions of Approval
EXHIBIT A

TTM – The condition applies to the Tentative Tract Map.
VAR – The condition applies to the Variance

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **TTM & VAR - PROJECT PERMITTED.** MA18089 (CZ18001, TTM37470 with exception to Section 7.10.080.C of Title 7, VAR18004) is for the subdivision of 6.74 gross acres into 34 single-family lots with common lot numbers 35 (open space) & 36 (water quality basin).

2. **TTM & VAR - INDEMNIFY CITY.** The applicant, the property owner or other holder of the right to the development entitlement(s) or permit(s) approved by the City for the project, if different from the applicant (herein, collectively, the “Indemnitor”), shall indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the City of Jurupa Valley and its elected city council, its appointed boards, commissions, and committees, and its officials, employees, and agents (herein, collectively, the “Indemnitees”) from and against any and all claims, liabilities, losses, fines, penalties, and expenses, including, without limitation, litigation expenses and attorney’s fees, arising out of either (i) the City’s approval of the project, including without limitation any judicial or administrative proceeding initiated or maintained by any person or entity challenging the validity or enforceability of any City permit or approval relating to the project, any condition of approval imposed by City on such permit or approval relating to the project, any condition of approval imposed by City on such permit or approval, and any finding or determination made and any other action taken by any of the Indemnitees in conjunction with such permit or approval, including, without limitation, any action taken pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), or (ii) the acts, omissions, or operations of the Indemnitor and the directors, officers, members, partners, employees, agents, contractors, and subcontractors of each person or entity comprising the Indemnitor with respect to the ownership, planning, design, construction, and maintenance of the project and the property for which the project is being approved. The City shall notify the Indemnitor of any claim, lawsuit, or other judicial or administrative proceeding (herein, an “Action”) within the scope of this indemnity obligation and request that the Indemnitor defend such Action with legal counsel reasonably satisfactory to the City. If the Indemnitor fails to so defend the Action, the City shall have the right, but not the obligation, to do so and, if it does, the Indemnitor shall promptly pay the City’s full cost thereof. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the indemnity obligation under clause (ii) of the first sentence of this condition shall not apply to the extent the claim arises out of the willful misconduct or the sole active negligence of the City.

3. **TTM & VAR - CONSENT TO CONDITIONS.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the property owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.
4. **TTM & VAR - MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

5. **TTM & VAR - FEES.** The approval of MA18089 (CZ18001, TTM37470 with exception, VAR18004) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

6. **TTM - APPROVAL PERIOD.** An approved or conditionally approved tentative map shall expire 36 months after such approval unless within that period of time a final map shall have been approved and filed with the County Recorder. Prior to the expiration date, the land divider may apply in writing for an extension of time pursuant to Title 7 of the Municipal Code.

7. **VAR – APPROVAL PERIOD.** Any variance that is granted shall be used within one (1) year from the effective date thereof, or within such additional time as may be set in the conditions of approval, which shall not exceed a total of three (3) years, except that a variance in connection with a land division may be used during the same period of time that the land division approval may be used; otherwise the variance shall be null and void.

8. **TTM - CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans listed below with changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:

   a) TTM37470
   b) Landscape Plan
   c) Maintenance Plan

9. **TTM – PLANNING REVIEW OF GRADING PLANS.** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the aesthetic impact of slopes and grade differences where the project adjoins streets or other properties shall be approved by the Planning Director.

10. **TTM – COVENANTS, CONDITIONS & RESTRICTIONS (CC & RS).** Prior to the recordation of the map, the applicant shall record CC & Rs providing for maintenance of the project in perpetuity that meets the Planning Director’s approval. The CC & R shall, at a minimum, include provisions for all of the following items:

   a) Formation of a home owner’s association (HOA). One HOA shall maintain both TTM37470 (MA18089 – Highland Park 2) and TTM31894 (MA1212 - Highland Park 1);

   b) Description of the responsibilities of HOA and property owner(s)

   c) HOA shall be responsible for the following items (at minimum):

      1. Ensuring the architecture of the homes is consistent with Highland Park’s (MA1212 TTM31894) development plan by conducting architectural review.
2. Maintenance of Lot 36 including any landscaping and lighting fixtures

3. Two-car garage shall be maintained at all times for each unit

d) Identify locations or areas to be maintained by home owner’s association, property owner(s), special districts, and City (if applicable) in text and by exhibit(s)

Any changes or modifications to the requirements of the CC & Rs shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Director.


a) Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a landscape and irrigation plan that includes an 8-foot-wide multi-purpose trail constructed of decomposed granite. The trail shall be consistent with this MA18089 conceptual landscape plan with the following exception: A five-foot wide landscaped planter with shrubs shall be constructed along the split-face block wall located on the rear property line of Lots 18 to 34.

In the event the adjacent properties (located to the west and south of TTM37470) are developed, this multi-purpose trail may be re-aligned to provide a more direct connection to the trail of Highland Park (MA1212 TTM31894).

The plan shall provide bollards that are fully shielded adjacent to the multi-purpose trail for public safety.

b) Prior to the final inspection of a building permit for a residential unit, the trail with the bollards shall be constructed in accordance to the plan.

12. TTM – MAINTENANCE OF MULTI-PURPOSE TRAIL ON LOTS 35 AND 36. The multi-purpose trail on Lots 35 and 36 shall be maintained by Jurupa Recreation Area Park District (JARPD). Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the first single-family unit of the tract, the applicant shall provide documentation that JARPD accepts maintenance of the multi-purpose trail to the Planning Department.

If JARPD does not accept the maintenance of the trail, the maintenance of the trail shall be the responsibility of the HOA.

13. TTM - ON-SITE LANDSCAPING. Prior to the issuance of the first Building permit, the applicant shall submit the following items, including landscape and irrigation as modified in accordance with this condition, for Planning Director’s review and approval:

a) Complete “Professional Services (PROS)” application (Planning) for the review of the final landscape, irrigation, and shading plans.

b) Initial deposit for PROS application.
c) The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, labor, and one-year maintenance.

d) Completed “City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements” form with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required amount of bond. This bond is for landscaping not within publicly maintained areas.

e) Completed City Landscape Agreement with original signatures after the City has reviewed the submitted cost estimate.

f) Three (3) sets of final on-site landscape, irrigation plans, shading plan with digital copies in 8.5” x 11” on a CD that shall address all the following requirements:

1. Compliance with Chapter 9.283 Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements

2. Consistent with the approved conceptual plans

3. Satisfies the conditions including Condition No. 11 (A five-foot wide landscaped planter with shrubs shall be constructed along the split-face block wall located on the rear property line of Lots 18 to 34.)

4. Add 5 more trees around the perimeter of the basin. Trees shall be spaced at 40 feet on center.

5. Provide an inventory of on-site existing trees 4” caliper or larger. Indicate caliper, approximate height, and condition. Provide an exhibit indicating which existing trees will be preserved.

6. Provide landscape erosion control planting and irrigation for all manufactured slopes 3 feet or taller or otherwise provide retaining walls at the property line.

7. Provide a preliminary horticultural soils report and recommendations upon which initial soil preparation specifications are based.

Prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy for MA18089 (TTM37470), the following events shall be satisfied in the order it is listed:

1. Substantial Conformance Letter: The Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department once the landscape architect has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans.

2. City Inspection: The City landscape architect shall conduct an inspection of the installation to confirm the landscape and irrigation plan was constructed in accordance to the approved plans.
14. **TTM – SDP APPROVAL FOR ARCHITECTURE & FLOOR PLANS.** The architecture and floor plan for this tract shall be consistent, in quality and aesthetics, with Highland Park 1 (MA1212 – TTM31894) as determined by the Planning Director.

   *Prior to the issuance of the first Building permit for a single-family unit*, a Site Development Permit (SDP) shall be submitted for the review and approval of plotting plan, architectural styles, and floor plans by the Planning Director.

15. **TTM – SDP APPROVAL FOR MODEL HOMES.** If model homes are proposed, a Site Development Permit application shall be submitted for the review and approval by the Planning Director *prior to the issuance of any building permit(s)* for the model homes.

16. **TTM – SDP APPROVAL FOR WALL & FENCE PLAN.** Prior to the issuance of the *first Building Permit for a unit*, the applicant shall submit a "Final Wall & Fence Plan" with a Site Development Permit application for the review and approval of the Planning Director. The plan shall be consistent with the MA18089 approval. All locations, dimensions, and construction materials for fences, walls, and gates shall be shown on the plans.

   a) No solid fence or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front setback.

   b) The maintenance gate shall be constructed with a material that is open view to allow the public to view into the basin area for safety.

   c) The decorative block walls shall comply with the following requirements:
      
      - All block walls that face a public street or face a common open space shall have anti-graffiti wall coating.
      - Pilasters shall be constructed at the following places:
        - Each end of the tract perimeter walls;
        - Each turn or corner (for example: at each corner of the rear yard)
        - Otherwise evenly spaced at approximately 30 feet on center but shall not exceed 40 feet apart.

17. **TTM - INCORPORATE CONDITIONS.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the owner or designee shall include within the first four pages of the working drawings a list of all conditions of approval imposed by the project's final approval.

18. **TTM – ACKNOWLEDGEMENT LETTER OF R-1 STANDARDS.** Prior to the issuance of *first building permit for a unit*, the applicant shall submit a written acknowledgement of the following development standards of R-1:

   a. Building setbacks

   b. Lot Coverage

19. **TTM - JURUPA AREA RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit proof of satisfying any fees,
dedications, or requirements by the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District to the Building Official.

20. TTM – IMPACT FEES. The applicant shall the pay the following impact fees (unless exempt) in accordance to Title 3 of the Municipal Code:

   a. Development Impact Fee (DIF) Program. The applicant shall pay any owed DIFs by the required deadline pursuant to Chapter 3.75 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

   b. Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Mitigation (MSHCP) Fee. The applicant shall pay any owed MSHCP fees by the required deadline pursuant to Chapter 3.80 of the Municipal Code.

   c. Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) Program. The applicant shall pay any owed TUMFs by the required deadline pursuant to Chapter 3.70 of the Municipal Code.

21. TTM – GARAGES. All residential units shall not have less than two parking spaces in a garage with roll-up door and shall be maintained at all times. Garage conversions shall only be permitted if a two-car garage is replaced in the original size and architectural style of the home.

22. TTM – MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF SOLID FENCES AND WALLS WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK. No solid fence or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front yard setback.

23. TTM - STREET TREES. Street trees and related security and agreements are required pursuant Chapter 7.55 of Title 7.

24. TTM - LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE. All landscaped areas shall be maintained as approved on the final landscape plans in an orderly, attractive and healthy condition. This shall include proper pruning, mowing of turf areas, weeding, removal of litter, fertilization, replacement of plants when necessary, and the regular application of appropriate quantities of water to all landscaped areas. Irrigation systems shall be maintained as approved on the final landscape plans in proper operating condition. Waterline breaks, head/emitter ruptures, overspray or runoff conditions and other irrigation system failures shall be repaired immediately. The applicant shall maintain canopy trees in a manner that they provide the required shade coverage and encourages the canopy to grow to provide shade. Avoid topping trees or pruning the trees in a manner that the trees do not achieve mature height and form.

25. TTM – REMOVAL OF GRAFFITI. The homeowner’s association (HOA) shall remove any graffiti on the common areas as soon as possible. In addition, if the HOA was notified by the City, the HOA shall remove the graffiti within seven (7) days of the City’s notice.
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)

1.1. The use hereby conditioned is for a Schedule "A" subdivision, Tentative Tract Map No. 37470; being a subdivision of a portion of Section 8 and Section 9, Township 2 South Range 5 West SBB & M.; more particularly Assessor's Parcels Number APNs 177-020-018, 177-020-012, and 177-110-005; consisting of 6.74 acres, into 34 numbered parcels for residential purposes, 2 numbered lots for open space purpose and water quality basin, and 1 lettered lot for road dedication. Exhibit titled Tentative Tract Map No. 37470, prepared by VSL Engineering, dated March 2018, is hereby referenced.

1.2. This land division shall comply with the State of California Subdivision Map Act, the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Riverside County Ordinance No. 460; as it pertains for Schedule "A" subdivision for residential purposes, unless otherwise modified by the conditions listed herein.

1.3. It is assumed that any easements shown on the referenced exhibits are shown correctly and include all the easements that encumber the subject property. The Applicant shall secure approval from all easement holders for all grading and improvements which are proposed over the respective easement or provide evidence that the easement has been relocated, quitclaimed, vacated, abandoned, easement holder cannot be found, or is otherwise of no affect. Should such approvals or alternate action regarding the easements not be provided, the Applicant may be required to amend or revise the permit application.

1.4. 30th Street is a Local Road (modified) with a right-of-way width of 66 feet. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on 30th Street as described on these conditions of approval. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. The Applicant shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.5. Existing Sierra Avenue will be realigned to the east by adjacent development. Future Street J, as identified on the referenced exhibit, is considered a Local Road. The applicant will be required to coordinate the alignment of the road with adjacent development for TTM31894. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements for the intersection of J Street and 30th Street per these conditions of approval.

1.6. Proposed Street A shall be dedicated as a public local road with a right-of-way width of 56 feet. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements per these conditions of approval. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road, curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The Applicant shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.7. New street lights are required on 30th Street and Street A. The Applicant shall
cause streetlight plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.8. In compliance with Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Orders this project is required to comply with the Water Quality Management Plan for Urban Runoff (WQMP). The WQMP addresses post-development water quality impacts from new development and redevelopment projects. Guidelines and templates to assist the developer in completing the necessary studies are available on-line at www.floodcontrol.co.riverside.ca.us under Programs and Services, Stormwater Quality.

1.9. Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be placed underground in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 460 and 461, as adopted by the City. This also applies to existing overhead lines which are 33.6 kilovolts or below within and along the project frontage and between the nearest poles offsite in each direction of the project site. All utility extensions within the subdivision and within individual lots shall be placed underground.

1.10. Owner will be required to form a Community Facilities District (CFD) for maintenance of parkway improvements as identified on these conditions of approval and approved by the Director of Public Works.

1.11. An Environmental Constraint Sheet (ECS) is required to be prepared for this project for filing with the City Engineer at the time of recording the Final Map.

2. PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

2.1. No grading permit shall be issued until the Tentative Tract Map (TTM), and all other related cases are approved and are in effect, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

2.2. The Developer shall prepare a “rough” grading plan or a combined “rough and precise” grading plan for the entire site. The grading plan shall be prepared under the supervision of a civil engineer licensed in the state of California (Project Civil Engineer) and he/she must sign the plan. The printed name and contact information of the Project Civil Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The grading plan shall be approved by the City Engineer.

2.2.1 The grading plan shall provide for acceptance and proper disposal of all off-site drainage flowing onto or through the site. Should the quantities of flow exceed the capacity of the conveyance facility, the Applicant shall provide adequate drainage facilities and/or appropriate easement(s), if necessary, as approved by the City Engineer.

2.2.2. The grading plan shall provide for protection of downstream properties from damages caused by alteration of the drainage patterns, i.e., concentration or diversion of flow. Protection shall be provided by constructing adequate drainage facilities including enlarging existing facilities and/or by securing a drainage easement(s), if necessary, as approved by the City Engineer.
2.2.3. Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following rough grading to prevent transport and deposition of earthen materials onto downstream/downwind properties, public rights-of-way, or other drainage facilities. Erosion Control Plans showing these measures shall be submitted along with the grading plan for approval by the City Engineer.

2.2.4. Driveway approaches shall be constructed per Riverside County Standard No. 207. Existing driveway approaches, if any, shall be removed and replaced with full height curb and gutter and adjacent sidewalk to match approved street sections.

2.2.5. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to commencement of grading.

2.3. Prior to approval of the grading plan, the applicant shall submit for review and approval of the City Engineer a project specific final geotechnical report.

2.3.1. Grading of the site shall be per the recommendations of the geotechnical report as reviewed and approved by the Engineering department.

2.3.2. A preliminary geotechnical report for the Proposed Single-Family Residential Development for the Highland Park Project, prepared by LGC Geoenvironmental, Inc.; dated July 27, 2018; was prepared and submitted during entitlement. Applicant shall address comments provided on the Engineering review letter dated September 20, 2018 prior to submittal of the final report for review.

2.3.3. Final report shall include percolation test and results for the water quality basin if infiltration is proposed.

2.4. Prior to approval of grading plans and if grading is required offsite, the Developer shall obtain written notarized letter of permission from the property owner(s) to grade as necessary and provide a copy to the Engineering Department. It shall be the sole responsibility of the Developer to obtain any and all proposed or required easements and/or permissions necessary to perform the grading shown on the site plan, tentative tract map and grading exhibits.

2.5. Prior to approval of grading plans, the applicant shall obtain written authorization from Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD) for any grading work and operations performed over or impacting the existing RCFC&WCD easement.

2.6. Prior to the issuance of the precise grading permit, the Applicant shall cause a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to be prepared in conformance with the requirements of the City of Jurupa Valley and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD) for approval of the City Engineer.

2.7. Prior to approval of the grading plan for disturbance of one (1) or more acres the landowner shall provide evidence that it has prepared and submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) a Storm Water Pollution Prevention plan (SWPPP). The SWRCB issued WDID number shall be included on the face of the grading plan.
2.8. Prior to issuance of the grading permit, the applicant shall obtain authorization from RCFC&WCD for basin overflow connection to their facilities.

2.9. Any proposed retaining walls will require a separate permit(s). Permits shall be obtained prior to the issuance of the precise grading permit unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer and Building Official.

2.10. Where grading involves import or export the Applicant shall obtain approval for the import/export location, from the Engineering department, if located in the City. If an Environmental Assessment did not previously address the import/export location a Grading Environmental Assessment shall be submitted to the Engineering Department for comment and to the Planning Director for review and approval. If import/export location is outside the City the Applicant shall provide evidence that the jurisdictional agency has provided all necessary, separate approvals for import/export to/from the site.

2.11. Where grading involves import or export using City streets the Applicant shall obtain approval of the haul route and a haul route permit from the Public Works Department.

2.12. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Applicant shall prepare a final Hydrology Report, corresponding with the proposed improvements, for approval of the City Engineer. The report shall be consistent with the proposed development and signed by a California licensed civil engineer.

2.12.1. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's standards.

2.12.2. Applicant is responsible for obtaining the necessary permits from Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCD) for connection to their facilities.

2.12.3. A preliminary Hydrology Report for the proposed development prepared by VSL Engineering, dated September 9, 2017, was prepared and submitted during the entitlement. Applicant shall address any comments made during the entitlement process and submit final report to the Engineering department for final review and approval.

2.13. The Applicant shall prepare separate landscaping and irrigation plans for areas within the street right-of-way for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.14. The Applicant shall prepare separate street improvement and street lighting plans for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.15. Where grading involves import to or export of more than 50 cubic yards from the site the Developer shall obtain approval for the import/export location from the Engineering Department if located in the City.

3. PRIOR TO FINAL MAP RECORDATION

3.1. No final Map shall be recorded until all other related cases, Change of Zone CZ18001 and Variance VAR18004, are approved and are in effect unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.
3.2. No final Map shall be recorded until the formation / annexation process for the Community Facilities (CFD) associated with this project, if any, is finalized.

3.2.1. Applicant shall prepare Landscape and Irrigation plans for CFD. Plans shall be prepared per Riverside County Ordinance No. 859 and per the City’s submittal guidelines and package.

3.2.2. CFD will include, but is not limited to, the maintenance of the following:

- Water Quality Basins;
- Tree trimming for trees within the public right-of-way, as identified on the CFD landscape plans and approved by the Director of Public Works;
- Landscape Maintenance
- Entry Monuments (if proposed)

3.2.3. The CFD will not maintain the parkway area in front of the homeowner’s lot. Property owners will be responsible of the maintenance of the landscaping in front of their homes within the public right-of-way. The following exception applies: the CFD will be responsible for the tree trimming of trees along parkways on public right-of-way.

3.2.4. Formation of an HOA for parkway improvements in lieu of CFD will require the City Engineer’s approval.

3.3. The Applicant shall provide improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer for all public improvements including, but not limited to, street improvements plans showing parkway improvements, road and pavement improvements, streetlights, landscape and irrigation, and water system.

3.4. Rights-of-way for streets and public utilities purposes shall be dedicated and shown on the final Map in accordance with these conditions of approval, the City’s Municipal Code, Riverside County Ordinance 460, and Riverside County Ordinance 461. It is understood that the Tentative Tract Map exhibit correctly shows acceptable centerlines, existing easements, traveled ways, and drainage courses, and that the omission or unacceptability may require that the Developer amend or revise the tentative map as may be necessary to allow a finding that the final Map is in substantial conformance with the tentative map.

3.5. The Applicant shall prepare improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer:

3.5.1. Applicant shall prepare plans for improvements on 30th Street consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible for the construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:

a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;

b) 22-ft wide paved road from centerline to curb face;
3.5.2. Applicant shall prepare plans for improvements for proposed in-tract Street A consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:

a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions, 36-ft wide paved road within a 56-ft right-of-way section (Riverside County Standard 105);
b) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report and connecting to the improvements on 30th Street;
c) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway.

3.5.3. Applicant shall prepare plans for improvements at the intersection of 30th Street, proposed Street A, and future J Street (existing Sierra Avenue), consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:

a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
b) Due to current line of sight restrictions and curvilinear alignment of Street A, the intersection of 30th Street with A and J Streets will be controlled by 3-way stop signs to be installed by the developer.
c) ADA compliant access ramps should be provided for crossing north and south legs of the intersection.
d) Parkway landscaping at the intersection of 30th Street with Street A and J Street should be selected such that adequate line of sight is maintained.

3.6. Should this project be within any assessment/benefit district, the Applicant shall make application for and pay any reapportionment of the assessment or pay the unit fees in the assessment/benefit district.

3.7. Applicant shall provide clearance letter from water and sewer utility purveyor, that all and any conditions by the water and sewer utility purveyor (if any) have been satisfied or appropriately initiated to its satisfaction.

3.8. Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be designed to be placed underground in accordance with Riverside County Ordinances 460 and 461, as adopted by the City. The Applicant is responsible for coordinating the work with the serving utility company. This requirement applies to underground existing overhead electrical lines which are 33.6 kilovolts or below along the project frontage and between the nearest poles offsite in each direction of the project site including services that originate from poles on the far side of the street. A disposition note describing the above shall be reflected on design improvement plans whenever those plans are required.
Written proof confirming initiation of the design of utility improvements or relocations, issued by the utility company, shall be submitted to the Engineering Department for verification purposes.

3.9. Applicant shall obtain approval by water and sewer purveyor for water system and sewer system improvement plans (if any). The plans shall be submitted to and approved by the appropriate service district and the City.

3.10. Prior to Final Map approval, the applicant shall submit for review and approval an application and complete package for the vacation of right-of-way, for that portion of the right-of-way at the easterly terminus of 30th street generally shown on the TTM. Vacation documents shall be approved and recorded prior to Final Map filing.

3.11. Agreement and securities for street improvements shall be in place.

4. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

4.1. The Project geotechnical/soils engineer shall certify to the completion of grading in conformance with the approved grading plans and the recommendations of the Geotechnical/Soils report approved for this project. Minimum street sections and traffic indexes are to be according to Riverside County Standards. Final sections may be greater based on the final R values determined by a Geologist registered in the State of California, and as approved by the City Engineer.

4.2. A licensed land surveyor or civil engineer shall certify to the completion of grading in conformance with the lines and grades shown on the approved grading plans.

4.3. The Applicant shall prepare a precise grading plan, if precise grading was not included in a combined "rough and precise" grading plan. The precise grading plan shall be approved by the City Engineer.

4.4. The site's BMP facilities and features shall be constructed as shown on the project's site grading plans or separate post-construction BMP improvement plans approved of the City Engineer. Post-construction water quality surface features and facilities such as basins and bio-swales are not required to be landscaped prior to issuance of building permits, but must be otherwise constructed and additional temporary erosion control measures in place as approved by the City Engineer.

4.5. The required domestic water system improvements, including fire hydrants, shall be installed and accepted.

5. PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION (ENGINEERING)

5.1. The Applicant is responsible for the completing off all grading and construction of all infrastructure improvements within the public right-of-way in accordance with approved plans, with Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the City, and with all other applicable requirements, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Applicant shall ensure that streetlights are energized along the streets.
where Applicant is seeking Building Final Inspection (Occupancy).

5.2. The Project geotechnical/soils engineer shall provide a Final Grading Certification, certifying to the completion of the precise grading in conformance with the approved grading plans, the recommendation of the Geotechnical/Soils report approved for this project and the California Building Code.

5.3. A licensed surveyor or civil engineer shall certify to the completion of precise grading in conformance with the lines and grades shown on the approved grading plans.

5.4. The Applicant is responsible for completing all landscaping and irrigation improvements within the public right-of-way as applicable. The Applicant shall provide a Landscaping Certificate of Completion to the City Engineer.

5.5. The Applicant is responsible for the completion of all post-construction water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) facilities and features. These facilities and features will require operation and maintenance in perpetuity by the Property Owner(s).

6. PRIOR TO BOND EXONERATION (ENGINEERING)

6.1. All street improvements must be completed and accepted by the City.

6.2. CFD maintained improvements shall be completed and accepted by the City Engineering.

6.3. The applicant is responsible for completing all utility mainline and service line extensions within and serving the project site, including but not limited to, electrical power, telephone, other communication, street lighting, and cable television as herein before required, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineering in writing. Utility extensions from the mainline or other points of connection within the public right-of-way require that the applicant obtained an Encroachment Permit from the Engineering Department. Correspondence from the respective utility company approving and accepting utility improvements shall be provided from each respective utility company. The City will make a final inspection of work to verify that any impacts that the work might have had to other City owned infrastructure is restored or repaired to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

The Applicant hereby agrees that these Conditions of Approval are valid and lawful and binding on the Applicant, and its successors and assigns, and agrees to the Conditions of Approval.

Applicant’s name (Print Form): __________________________________________

Applicant’s name (Signature): __________________________________________

Date: ____________________
EXHIBIT B OF ATTACHMENT NO. 2

MND with MMRP
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City of Jurupa Valley Master Application No. 18089

Change of Zone No. 18001
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MASTER APPLICATION NO. 18089 SUMMARY

**Change of Zone (CZ) No. 18001**: Amend the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One Family Dwelling).

**Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37470 with an Exception**: Subdivide 6.76 acres of land into 34 single-family residential lots with a minimum lot size of 5,711 square feet. The exception is to allow several lots out of 34 lots to have lot depth greater than 2 ½ times than the lot width.

**Variance (VAR) No. 18004**: The Variance application is to request the change of minimum lot area from 7,200 square-feet to 5,711 square-feet and the minimum average frontage of lot from 60 feet to 50 feet.
1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of an Initial Study

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that before a public agency makes a decision to approve a project that could have one or more adverse effects on the physical environment, the agency must inform itself about the project’s potential environmental impacts, give the public an opportunity to comment on the environmental issues, and take feasible measures to avoid or reduce potential harm to the physical environment.

The purpose of this Initial Study is to provide a preliminary analysis of a proposed action to determine whether a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report should be prepared for a project. An Initial Study also enables an applicant or the City of Jurupa Valley to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts in lieu of preparing an Environmental Impact Report, thereby potentially enabling the project to qualify for a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

1.2 Purpose of a Mitigated Negative Declaration

A Mitigated Negative Declaration is a written statement by the City of Jurupa Valley that the Initial Study identified potentially significant environmental effects of the Project but the Project is revised or mitigation measures are required to eliminate or mitigate impacts to less than significant levels.

1.3 Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration Document

This document in its entirety is an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including all criteria, standards, and procedures of CEQA (California Public Resource Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15000 et seq.).

1.4 Public Review and Processing of the Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration

This Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Notice of Intent to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration was distributed to the following entities for a 30-day public review period:

1) The State Clearinghouse;

2) Organizations and individuals who have previously requested such notice in writing to the City of Jurupa Valley;

3) Responsible and trustee agencies (public agencies that have a level of discretionary approval over some component of the proposed Project); and

4) The Riverside County Clerk.
The Notice of Intent also was noticed to the general public in the *Riverside Press-Enterprise*, which is a primary newspaper of circulation in the areas affected by the Project.

The Notice of Intent identifies the location(s) where the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and its associated Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program and technical reports are available for public review. During the 30-day public review period, comments on the adequacy of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration document may be submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department.

Following the 30-day public review period, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department will review any comment letters received during to determine whether any substantive comments were provided that may warrant revisions or recirculation to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration document. If recirculation is not required (as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15073.5(b)), written and/or oral responses will be provided to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission for review as part of their deliberations concerning the Project.

For this Project, the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission has the authority to recommend, conditionally recommend, or not recommend the Project for approval. The Jurupa Valley City Council has exclusive authority to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the Project. Accordingly, public hearings will be held before the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission and City Council to consider the proposed Project and the adequacy of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. At the conclusion of the public hearing process, the City Council will take action to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the proposed Project. If approved, the City Council will adopt findings relative to the Project's environmental effects as disclosed in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Notice of Determination will be filed with the Riverside County Clerk.

### 1.5 Initial Study /Mitigated Negative Declaration Findings and Conclusions

Section 3.0 of this document contains the Environmental Checklist/Initial Study that was prepared for the proposed Project pursuant to CEQA and City of Jurupa Valley requirements.

The environmental factors marked with an “X” below would be potentially affected by this Project and thus require mitigation to reduce impacts to “less than significant” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.
The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the Lead Agency (City of Jurupa Valley), that the Project may have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, based on the findings of the Initial Study Checklist, the City of Jurupa Valley determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the appropriate CEQA determination for the Project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15070(b).
2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.1 Project Location

The City of Jurupa Valley covers approximately 43.5 square miles within the County of Riverside. The City is bordered by the City of Fontana and County of San Bernardino to the north, City of Norco to the south, City of Eastvale to the west, and City of Riverside and County of San Bernardino to the east. Specifically, the Project is located on the south side of intersection of Sierra Avenue & 30th Street. (Refer to Exhibit 1).

The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 177-020-012, 177-020-018, and 177-110-005.

2.2 Project Description

The Project Applicant, JA Bray, LLC, submitted the following applications to the City of Jurupa Valley which comprise the proposed Project: Change of Zone (CZ) No. 18001, Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37470 with an Exception to Section 7.10.080 (C) of Title 7., and Variance (VAR) No. 18004. The City of Jurupa Valley also refers to these applications as Master Application (MA) No. 18089. The Project’s application materials are on file with the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509 and are hereby incorporated by reference.

A. Change of Zone No. 18001: Amend the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One-Family Dwellings).

B. Tentative Tract Map No. 37470

Subdivide 6.76 acres of land into 34 single-family residential lots with a minimum lot size of 5,711 square feet and related infrastructure and landscaping improvements.

Street Improvements

The Project proposes the following street improvements:

- 30th Street is proposed to be improved as a Local Street within a half-width right-of-way of 33-feet with 2 travel lanes, a 6-foot wide landscaped parkway, and a 5-foot wide sidewalk adjacent to the Project site.

- Proposed Street A is proposed to be improved as a Local Street within a full-width right-of-way of 56-feet with 2 travel lanes, a 5-foot wide landscaped parkway, and a 5-foot wide sidewalk adjacent to the Project site.

Trails

A 10-foot wide multi-purpose trail easement is proposed along the western and southern boundaries of the Project site.

Drainage Improvements
Drainage will flow in Street A from north to south where it will be captured in the water quality basin at the southern end of the Project site. After first flush treatment, it will be discharged via a storm drain line that will connect to the storm drain line maintained by the Riverside County Flood Control District which borders the western boundary of the Project site.

**Sewer and Water Improvements**

An 8-inch sewer line will be constructed that connects via an easement between Lot 15 and Lot 16 and will connect to the sewer system within Tract 31894 to the east of the Project site.

An 8-inch water line will be constructed in Street A to connect to the water line in 30th Street.

**Construction Duration**

Project construction is anticipated to occur over 13-month period. (Refer to Section 4.3, *Air Quality*, for additional details.

**C. Variance No. 18004.**

The Variance application is to request the change of (1) minimum lot area from 7,200 square-feet to 5,711 square-feet and (2) minimum lot frontage from 60 feet to 50 feet.

**D. De-Annexation of Jurupa Community Services District to Rubidoux Community Services District.**

The Project site is located within the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD). The JCSD Board of Directors approved a “no contest” action that supports the de-annexation of the Project site from JCSD and the annexation of the Project site to the Rubidoux Community Services District. As such, water and sewer service will be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District.

**2.3 Existing Site Conditions/Environmental Setting**

CEQA Guidelines §15125 establishes requirements for defining the environmental setting to which the environmental effects of a proposed project must be compared. The environmental setting is defined as “…the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the Notice of Preparation is published, or if no Notice of Preparation is published, at the time the environmental analysis is commenced…” (CEQA Guidelines §15125[a]). A Notice of Preparation was not required at the time the Initial Study Checklist was commenced. Thus the environmental setting for the Project is the approximate date that the Project’s Initial Study Checklist commenced on April 30, 2018.

The Property is approximately 6.76-acres in size and located on the south side of 30th Street between 30th Street and Canal Street. The Property is currently undeveloped land. The soils and vegetation on the proposed Project site have been disturbed historically by quarry activities, off-highway vehicle activity, illegal dumping, and recreational use. The soils on the proposed Project site are loose sands and sandy loam. The dominant plant community on the Project site is non-
native annual grassland. Elevation at the site varies from approximately 880 to 910 feet above mean sea level. Current access to the Project site is provided by 30th Street to the north which is a paved 2-lane roadway and has no curb, gutter or sidewalk adjacent to the site.

Currently, the Project site is frequently disturbed by off-highway vehicle use, illicit dumping, and several campsites built by vagrant trespassers. The proposed Project site was also used to for staging of equipment, to access the railroad, and for truck access to the home framing storage yard located southwest of the proposed Project site. In the past, the proposed Project site was used for farming and cultivated crops. The fence in the center of the Project site also has an earthen berm along the fence row. An earthen berm was constructed along the railroad easement and Canal Street south of the Project site. The Project site was crisscrossed by many roads over the past 20 years during the construction of Line A and the houses north of 30th Street. The three rail spurs and buildings constructed for the granite rock quarry in 1940 altered the land along the eastern edge of the proposed project. Existing and surrounding land uses are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Vacant land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>30th street with single-family homes further to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Railroad tracks with Canal Street and single-family homes further to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Vacant land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Vacant land with Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center, single-family residences, and a vehicle storage facility further to the west.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Inspection, April 2018

2.4 Existing General Plan Land Use and Zoning Designations

The City Council adopted the City of Jurupa Valley's first locally prepared General Plan on September 7, 2017. The 2017 General Plan is the primary tool to guide the development and character of Jurupa Valley for the next five to ten years.

The Project site's land use designation is Medium Density Residential (MDR) which allows residential development at 2-5 dwelling units per acre. A summary of the existing General Plan land use and zoning designations for the Project site and surrounding properties is provided in Table 2.
### Table 2. Existing and Surrounding General Plan Designations and Zoning Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>R-R (Rural Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>R-1 (Single Family Residential) &amp; R-4 (Planned Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial) R-1 (Single Family Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>R-4 (Planned Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>R-R (Rural Residential) M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: City of Jurupa Valley-General Plan Land Use Map March 2018, City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map March 2018*
3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Evaluation Format

This Initial Study Checklist has been prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The Project is evaluated based on its potential effect on eighteen (18) environmental factors categorized as follows, as well as Mandatory Findings of Significance:

1. Aesthetics
2. Agriculture & Forestry Resources
3. Air Quality
4. Biological Resources
5. Cultural Resources
6. Geology & Soils
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions
8. Hazards & Hazardous Materials
9. Hydrology & Water Quality
10. Land Use & Planning
11. Mineral Resources
12. Noise
13. Population & Housing
14. Public Services
15. Recreation
16. Transportation & Traffic
17. Tribal Cultural Resources
18. Utilities and Service Systems
19. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Each factor is analyzed by responding to a series of questions pertaining to the impact of the Project on the particular factor in the form of a checklist. This Initial Study Checklist provides a manner to analyze the impacts of the Project on each factor in order to determine the severity of the impact and determine if mitigation measures can be implemented to reduce the impact to less than significant without having to prepare an Environmental Impact Report.

CEQA also requires Lead Agencies to evaluate potential environmental effects based to the fullest extent possible on scientific and factual data (CEQA Guidelines §15064[b]). A determination of whether or not a particular environmental impact will be significant must be based on substantial evidence, which includes facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts (CEQA Guidelines §15064[f][5]).

The effects of the Project are then placed in the following four categories, which are each followed by a summary to substantiate why the Project does not impact the particular factor with or without mitigation. If “Potentially Significant Impacts” that cannot be mitigated are determined, then the Project does not qualify for a Mitigated Negative Declaration and an Environmental Impact Report must be prepared:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially significant impact(s) have been identified or anticipated that cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. An Environmental Impact Report must therefore be prepared.</td>
<td>Potentially significant impact(s) have been identified or anticipated, but mitigation is possible to reduce impact(s) to a less than significant category. Mitigation measures must then be identified.</td>
<td>No “significant” impact(s) identified or anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td>No impact(s) identified or anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the impact analysis in this Initial Study Checklist, reference is made to the following:

- **Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP)** – These include existing regulatory requirements such as plans, policies, or programs applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduce environmental impacts.

- **Project Design Features (PDF)** – These measures include features proposed by the Project that are already incorporated into the Project’s design and are specifically intended to reduce or avoid impacts (e.g., water quality treatment basins).

- **Mitigation Measures (MM)** – These measures include requirements that are imposed where the impact analysis determines that implementation of the proposed Project would result in significant impacts. Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce impacts to less than significant levels in accordance with the requirements of CEQA.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) and the Project Design Features (PDF) were assumed and accounted for in the assessment of impacts for each issue area if applicable.
Mitigation Measures (MM) were formulated only for those issue areas where the results of the impact analysis identified significant impacts that could be reduced to less than significant levels.

All three types of measures described above may be required to be implemented as part of the Project, and will be included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project.

**Environmental Factors Requiring Mitigation**

The environmental factors marked with an “X” below would be potentially affected by this Project and thus require mitigation to reduce impacts to “less than significant” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>☐ Aesthetics</th>
<th>☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources</th>
<th>☐ Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Biological Resources</td>
<td>☒ Cultural Resources</td>
<td>☐ Geology /Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>☒ Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>☐ Hydrology / Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Land Use / Planning</td>
<td>☐ Mineral Resources</td>
<td>☐ Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Population / Housing</td>
<td>☐ Public Services</td>
<td>☐ Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>☒ Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>☐ Utilities/Service Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

- ☒ Environmental Factors Marked for Mitigation
Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed use COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be recommended for adoption.

I find that although the proposal could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made by or agreed to by the Project Applicant. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be recommended for adoption.

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

I find that the proposal MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated.” An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effect (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, pursuant to all applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures are are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director

City of Jurupa Valley

Printed Name/Title

November 12, 2018

Date
Appendices (Under Separate Cover or on Compact Disk)


### 3.1 AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 3.1 (a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**  
*Sources: General Plan, Google Earth, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts related to scenic vistas. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.1-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 9.55.020(1) building height shall not exceed three (3) stories, with a maximum height of forty (40) feet.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

The Project site is approximately 6.76 gross acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. Land uses surrounding to the north are 30th Street with single-family homes further to the north, to the south are railroad tracks with Canal Street and single-family homes further to the south, to the east is vacant land, and to the west is vacant land with Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center, single-family residences, and a vehicle storage facility further to the west.
According to the *General Plan*, scenic vistas are points or corridors that are accessible to the public and that provide a view of scenic areas and/or landscapes. According to *General Plan Figure 4-23*, the Project site is not adjacent to a scenic corridor.

Scenic vistas in the Project vicinity are the Jurupa Hills located approximately 6,000 feet to the northwest of the Project site and the foothills of Rattlesnake Mountain located approximately 3,000 feet to the northeast of the Project site.

As required by PPP 3.1-1 above, the future buildings proposed on the property will be restricted to 30 feet in height. As such, the Project would not block or completely obstruct views from surrounding public vantage points to the Jurupa Hills or Rattlesnake Mountain visible in the horizon under existing conditions.

Based on the analysis above, impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant.

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

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Sources: California Department of Transportation “Scenic Highway Program Eligible and Officially Designated Routes,” General Plan, General Plan Figure 4.23, Google Earth.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

California’s Scenic Highway Program was created by the Legislature in 1963. Its purpose is to protect and enhance the natural scenic beauty of California highways and adjacent corridors, through special conservation treatment. The state laws governing the Scenic Highway Program are found in the Streets and Highways Code, Sections 260 through 263.

According to the California Department of Transportation, the Project site is not located within a State Scenic Highway. In addition, according to *General Plan Figure 4-23*, the Project site is not adjacent to a scenic corridor. As such, there is no impact.
3.1 (c) **Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**
Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Construction Impacts**

During the Project's temporary construction period, construction equipment, supplies, and activities would be visible on the subject property from immediately surrounding areas. Construction activities are a common occurrence in the developing inland region of Riverside County and are not considered to substantially degrade the area's visual quality. All construction equipment would be removed from the Project site following completion of the Project's construction activities. For these reasons, the temporary visibility of construction equipment and activities at the Project site would not substantially degrade the visual character of the surrounding area.

**Operational Impacts**

The visual character of the Project site would change from disturbed, vacant land to a 34-lot subdivision for construction of single-family residences. A project is generally considered to have a significant impact on visual character if it substantially changes the character of the project site such that it becomes visually incompatible or visually unexpected when viewed in the context of its surroundings.

The Project site is in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. Land uses surrounding to the north are 30th Street with single-family homes further to the north, to the south are railroad tracks with Canal Street and single-family homes further to the south, to the east is vacant land, and to the west is vacant land with Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center, single-family residences, and a vehicle storage facility further to the west.

In addition, the Project site currently planned for Medium Density Residential uses by the General Plan (Up to 5 dwelling units per acre). Residential development with single-family residences has been anticipated for the Project site. The introduction of single-family residences will be compatible to the existing development in the surrounding area.

Based on the analysis above, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
3.1 (d)  Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day
or nighttime views in the area?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following apply to the Project and would help reduce impacts related to light and glare. These
measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure
compliance:

PPP 3.1-2  As required by General Plan Policy COS 10.1, require outdoor lighting to be shielded
and prohibit outdoor lighting that:

1. Operates at unnecessary locations, levels, and times.
2. Spills onto areas off-site or to areas not needing or wanting illumination.
3. Produces glare (intense line-of-site contrast).
4. Includes lighting frequencies (colors) that interfere with astronomical viewing.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

The Project would increase the amount of light in the area above what is being generated by the
vacant site by directly adding new sources of illumination including security and decorative lighting
for the future residential structures and street lighting. With implementation of PPP 3.1-3, impacts
relating to lighting would be less than significant.

The primary exterior of the proposed homes would be constructed of stucco which is not a
reflective surface. As such, impacts relating to glare would be less than significant.
3.2 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 (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?

**Determination: No Impact**

*Sources: California Department of Conservation “Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

The site does not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as mapped by the State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. As such, the Project has no potential to convert such lands to a non-agricultural use and no impact would occur.

3.2 (b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Sources: General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Agricultural Zoning**

The Project site currently has a zoning classification of R-R (Rural Residential). The Project is proposing a change of zone to R-1 (One family Dwellings) which allows single-family detached housing with a minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet. The R-1 Zone is not considered a primary agricultural zone. As such, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use if the change of zone were approved.

**Williamson Act**

Pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, a Williamson Act Contract enables private landowners to voluntarily enter into contracts with local governments for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners
receive lower property tax assessments based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. According to the Riverside County Geographic Information System, the site is not under a Williamson Act Contract. As such, there is no impact.

### 3.2 (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))?

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Sources: General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

The Project is proposing a change of zone from R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One Family Dwellings). The Project site does not contain any forest lands, timberland, or timberland zoned as Timberland Production, nor are any forest lands or timberlands located on or nearby the Project site. Because no lands on the Project site are zoned for forestland or timberland, the Project has no potential to impact such zoning. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: Field Survey.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

The Project site and surrounding properties do not contain forest lands, are not zoned for forest lands, nor are they identified as containing forest resources by the General Plan. Because forest land is not present on the Project site or in the immediate vicinity of the Project site, the Project has no potential to result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.
3.2 (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?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: California Department of Conservation, Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)
There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program classifies portions of the Project site as Farmland of Local Importance. Farmland of Local Importance is either currently producing, or has the capability of production; but does not meet the criteria of Prime, Statewide or Unique Farmland. The General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element contains policies to encourage the continuation of land that is in active agricultural production. The dominant plant community on the Project site is non-native annual grassland and is considered to be Fallow Agricultural Land. The description of this habitat and vegetation communities is based on the definitions found in MSHCP Section 2.1.3 and A Manual of California Vegetation: Second Edition (Sawyer et al. 2009). Fallow Agricultural Land includes fallow fields that have been recently disked, plowed, or are no longer used to produce crops and are slowly being encroached by non-native herbaceous plant species. In some cases, native annual wildflowers become established in fallow agricultural lands. As such, the Project site is not currently providing active agricultural land of use to the local economy.

In addition, the Project site is approximately 6.76 gross acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. Land uses surrounding to the north are 30th Street with single-family homes further to the north, to the south are railroad tracks with Canal Street and single-family homes further to the south, to the east is vacant land, and to the west is vacant land with Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center, single-family residences, and a vehicle storage facility further to the west. In addition, the Project site is planned for residential uses by the General Plan and this type of development has been anticipated for the Project site.

Based on the analysis above, the Project would not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use and no impacts would occur.
3.3 AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 (a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (South Coast Air Quality Management District)?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A), SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Federal Air Quality Standards**

Under the Federal Clean Air Act, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency establishes health-based air quality standards that California must achieve. These are called “national (or federal) ambient air quality standards” and they apply to what are called “criteria pollutants.” Ambient (i.e. surrounding) air quality standard establish a concentration above which a criteria pollutant is known to cause adverse health effects to people. The national ambient air quality standards apply to the following criteria pollutants:

- Ozone (8-hour standard)
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM\textsubscript{10})
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM\textsubscript{2.5})
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO\textsubscript{x})
- Sulphur Dioxide (SO\textsubscript{2}), and
- Lead.

**State Air Quality Standards**

Under the California Clean Air Act, the California Air Resources Board also establishes health-based air quality standards that cities and counties must meet. These are called “state ambient air quality standards” and they apply to the following criteria pollutants:

- Ozone (1-hour standard)
- Ozone (8-hour standard)
- Respirable Particulate Matter (PM\textsubscript{10})
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM\textsubscript{2.5})
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO\textsubscript{x})
- Sulphur Dioxide (SO\textsubscript{2}), and
- Lead

**Regional Air Quality Standards**

The City of Jurupa Valley is located within the South Coast Air Basin which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The District develops plans and regulations designed to achieve these both the national and state ambient air quality standards described above.

**Attainment Designation**

An “attainment” designation for an area signifies that criteria pollutant concentrations did not exceed the established standard. In contrast to attainment, a “nonattainment” designation indicates that a criteria pollutant concentration has exceeded the established standard.

Table 3 shows the attainment status of criteria pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>State Designation</th>
<th>Federal Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone – 1 hour standard</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>No Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone – 8 hour standard</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respirable Particulate Matter (PM\textsubscript{10})</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM\textsubscript{2.5})</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Pollutant</td>
<td>State Designation</td>
<td>Federal Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (N0x)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2015

**Air Quality Management Plan**

The South Coast Air Quality Management District is required to produce air quality management plans directing how the South Coast Air Basin’s air quality will be brought into attainment with the national and state ambient air quality standards. The most recent air quality management plan is the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan and it is applicable to City of Jurupa Valley. The purpose of the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan is to achieve and maintain both the national and state ambient air quality standards described above.

In order to determine if a project is consistent with the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan, the South Coast Air Quality Management District has established consistency criterion which are defined in Chapter 12, Sections 12.2 and 12.3 of the South Coast Air Quality Management District's CEQA Air Quality Handbook and are discussed below.

**Consistency Criterion No. 1:** The proposed project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan.

Consistency Criterion No. 1 refers to violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards and National Ambient Air Quality Standards. As evaluated under Issues 3.3 (b), (c), and (d) below, the Project would not exceed regional or localized significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant during construction or during long-term operation. Accordingly, the Project’s regional and localized emissions would not contribute substantially to an existing or potential future air quality violation or delay the attainment of air quality standards.

**Consistency Criterion No. 2:** The proposed project will not exceed the assumptions in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan.

The 2016 Air Quality Management Plan demonstrates that the applicable ambient air quality standards can be achieved within the timeframes required under federal law. Growth projections from local general plans adopted by cities in the district are provided to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), which develops regional growth forecasts, which are then used to develop future air quality forecasts for the AQMP.

The General Plan Land Use Designation currently assigned to the Project is Medium Density Residential (MDR). The future emission forecasts contained in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan are primarily based on demographic and economic growth projections provided by the Southern California Association of Governments. The Project was planned for residential development with a density of up to 5 dwelling units per acre at the time the 2016 Air Quality...
Management Plan adopted. Therefore, the Project will not exceed the growth forecast estimates used in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan.

For the reasons stated above, the Project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan. In addition, the Project would not exceed the growth assumptions in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan. As such, the Project would be consistent with the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan and impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3(b)</th>
<th>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Source: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts related to air quality violations. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

**PPP 3.3-1** The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, “Fugitive Dust.” Rule 403 requires implementation of best available dust control measures during construction activities that generate fugitive dust, such as earth moving and stockpiling activities, grading, and equipment travel on unpaved roads. Measures listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any grading permits:

- “All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 25 mph per SCAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust emissions.”

- “The contractor shall ensure that all disturbed unpaved roads and disturbed areas within the Project are watered at least three (3) times daily during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work is done for the day.”

- “The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.”

**PPP 3.3-2** The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality District Rule 431.2, “Sulphur Content and Liquid Fuels.” The purpose of this rule is to
limit the sulfur content in diesel and other liquid fuels for the purpose of both reducing the formation of sulfur oxides and particulates during combustion and to enable the use of add-on control devices for diesel fueled internal combustion engines.

PPP 3.3-3 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113; “Architectural Coatings” Rule 1113 limits the release of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) into the atmosphere during painting and application of other surface coatings. The measure listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any building permits:

- “In order to limit the VOC content of architectural coatings used in the SCAB, architectural coatings shall be no more than a low VOC default level of 50 g/L unless otherwise specified in the SCAQMD Table of Standards (pg. 32-33).”

PPP 3.3-4 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 “PM\textsubscript{10} Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations” and Rule 1186.1, “Less-Polluting Street Sweepers.” Adherence to Rule 1186 and Rule 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

As shown in Table 3 above, the South Coast Air Basin, in which the Project is located, is considered to be in “non-attainment” status for several criteria pollutants.

The South Coast Air Quality Management District has developed regional and localized significance thresholds for regulated pollutants. Any project in the South Coast Air Basin with daily emissions that exceed any of the indicated regional or localized significance thresholds would be considered to contribute to a projected air quality violation. The Project’s regional and localized air quality impacts are discussed below.

Regional Impact Analysis

As with any new development project, the Project has the potential to generate pollutant concentrations during both construction activities and long-term operation. The following provides an analysis based on the applicable regional significance thresholds established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District in order to meet national and state air quality standards which are shown in Table 4 below.
Both construction and operational emissions for the Project were estimated by using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) which is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies to quantify potential criteria pollutant emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model can be used for a variety of situations where an air quality analysis is necessary or desirable such as California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents and is authorized for use by the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

**Construction Related Impacts**

Short-term criteria pollutant emissions will occur during site grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating activities. Emissions will occur from use of equipment, worker, vendor, and hauling trips, and disturbance of onsite soils (fugitive dust).

Table 5 describes the type of construction equipment to be used for the Project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Equipment Unit Amount</th>
<th>Hours Per Day Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welders</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>Cement and Mortar Mixers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pavers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving Equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rollers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>Air Compressors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).*

Table 6 shows the tentative Project construction schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase No.</th>
<th>Phase Name</th>
<th>Phase Start Date</th>
<th>Phase End Date</th>
<th>Number of Days/Weeks</th>
<th>Total Number of Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>2/8/2019</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>2/9/2019</td>
<td>2/20/2019</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>1/8/2020</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>1/9/2020</td>
<td>2/3/2020</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>2/4/2020</td>
<td>2/27/2020</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).*

The estimated maximum regional daily construction emissions are summarized in Table 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>VOV (ROG)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>45.64</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coatings</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Daily Emissions</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>45.64</td>
<td>30.87</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Thresholds</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).*

As shown in Table 7, emissions resulting from the Project construction would not exceed numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and therefore no mitigation is required.
Long-Term Regional Operation Related Impacts

Long-term criteria air pollutant emissions will result from the operation of the proposed Project. Long-term emissions are categorized as area source emissions, energy demand emissions, and operational emissions. Operational emissions will result from automobile, truck, and other vehicle sources associated with daily trips to and from the Project. Area source emissions are the combination of many small emission sources that include use of outdoor landscape maintenance equipment, use of consumer products such as cleaning products, and periodic repainting of the proposed Project. Energy demand emissions result from use of electricity and natural gas.

The results of the CalEEMod model for summer and winter operation of the Project are summarized in Table 8 below (Maximum Operational Daily Emissions). Based on the results of the model, operational emissions associated with operation the Project will not exceed the thresholds established by SCAQMD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROG (VOC)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Emissions</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 7, emissions resulting from the Project construction would not exceed numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and therefore no mitigation is required.

Based on the analysis above, regional air quality impacts for operational emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Localized Impact Analysis

As part of the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s environmental justice program, attention has been focusing more on the localized effects of air quality. Although the region may be in attainment for a particular criteria pollutant, localized emissions from construction and operational activities coupled with ambient pollutant levels can cause localized increases in criteria pollutant that exceed national and/or State air quality standards. The South Coast Air Quality Management District has established Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) which were developed in response to environmental justice and health concerns raised by the public regarding exposure of individuals to criteria pollutants in local communities.

Localized Significance Thresholds are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: oxides of nitrogen (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM10) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM2.5). Localized Significance Threshold’s represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable national or state ambient air quality standard, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor.
Construction-Related Localized Emissions

Construction localized impacts were evaluated pursuant to the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Final Localized Significance Thresholds Methodology. This methodology provides screening tables for one through five-acre project construction scenarios, depending on the amount of site disturbance during a day. Maximum daily oxides of nitrogen (NOX), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) emissions will occur during construction of the Project, grading of the Project site, and paving of streets and driveways. Table 7 below summarize on-site emissions as compared to the local screening thresholds established for Source Receptor Area (SRA) 23 (Metropolitan Riverside/Mira Loma).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>NOX</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Emissions</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 9, emissions resulting from the Project construction would not exceed LST numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and no mitigation is required.

Operational-Related Localized Emissions

On-site operational activities can result in localized increases in criteria pollutant levels that can cause air quality standards to be exceeded even if standards are not exceeded on a regional level. On-site area and energy sources were evaluated. As shown in Table 10, emissions resulting from the Project operations would not exceed LST numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and no mitigation is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>NOX</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Emissions</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO Hot Spots

CO Hot Spots are typically associated with idling vehicles at extremely busy intersections (i.e., intersections with an excess of 100,000 vehicle trips per day). There are no intersections in the vicinity of the Project site which exceed the 100,000 vehicle per day threshold typically associated with CO Hot Spots. In addition, the South Coast Air Basin has been designated as an attainment area for CO since 2007. Therefore, Project-related vehicular emissions would not create a Hot Spot and would not substantially contribute to an existing or projected CO Hot Spot.

Based on the analysis above, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
3.3(c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Source: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Study (Appendix A),*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts related to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

(Refer to PPP 3.3.1 through PPP 3.3-4 under Issue 3.3(b) above).

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

According to the SCAQMD, individual projects that do not generate operational or construction emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project specific impacts would also not cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment, and, therefore, would not be considered to have a significant, adverse air quality impact. Alternatively, individual project-related construction and operational emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds for project-specific impacts would be considered cumulatively considerable.

As discussed in Issue 3.3(b) above, the Project would not exceed the regional or localized significance thresholds for construction activities. As such, the Project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

Based on the analysis above, impacts would be less than significant.

3.3(d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Source: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Study (Appendix A), Health Risk Assessment (Appendix B).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts related to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

(Refer to PPP 3.3.1 through PPP 3.3-4 under Issue 3.3(b) above).
Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors (i.e., children, senior citizens, and acutely or chronically ill people) are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the general population. Land uses that are considered sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, hospitals, convalescent homes, and retirement homes. The closest sensitive receptors would be the residential homes to the north of the Project site.

Localized Impacts

As shown on Tables 9 and 10 above under the discussion of Issue 3.3 (b), the Project would not exceed any of the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Localized Significance Thresholds during near-term construction or long-term operation. In addition, the Project would not create a CO Hot Spot. Accordingly, Project-related localized emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction or long-term operation and impacts would be less than significant.

Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC)

As determined in the California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2015) 62 Cal. 4th 369 (CBIA) case the California Supreme Court determined that CEQA does not generally require an analysis of impacts of the existing environmental conditions on the future residents of a proposed project and generally only requires an analysis of the proposed project’s impact on the environment. However, the CBIA case also stated that when a proposed project brings development and people into an area already subject to specific hazards and the new development/people exacerbate the existing hazards, then CEQA requires an analysis of those hazards and the proposed project’s effect in terms of increasing the risks related to those hazards.

In regard to air quality hazards, Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) are defined as substances that may cause or contribute to an increase in deaths or in serious illness or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. As such, if a proposed project would not exacerbate pre-existing hazards (e.g., TAC health risks) then an analysis of those hazards and the proposed project’s effect on increasing those hazards is not required. The existing conditions on the project site only include vacant land that does not contain any operational land uses that emit TACs.

During construction, diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from heavy equipment use and heavy-duty trucks and would temporarily add to the health risk from DPM in the Project area that is primarily a result from heavy-duty trucks operating on State Route 60, near the Project site. Heavy-duty construction equipment is subject to an ARB Airborne Toxics Control Measure for in-use diesel construction equipment to reduce diesel particulate emissions. As described above for the LST analysis, PM10 (representative of DPM, which is a TAC) emissions and exposure would be minimal and below the SCAQMD LSTs.

The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are residences located approximately 120 feet north of the Project site and the Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center located approximately 600 feet to the
west of the Project site. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, health risks should be based on a 70-year exposure period for the maximally exposed individual resident; however, such assessments should be limited to the period/duration of activities associated with the project. Since the proposed Project involves phased construction activities in many areas across the Project site, the exposure of any proximate individual sensitive receptor to TACs would be limited. Due to the temporary nature of construction (that would only occur over approximately 13 months) exposure at any individual sensitive receptor and minimal particulate emissions generated on the Project site, TACs generated during construction would not be expected to result in concentrations causing significant health risks.

Operation of the proposed Project would not result in any non-permitted direct emissions (e.g., those from a point source such as diesel generators) or result in a substantial increase in diesel vehicles (i.e., delivery trucks). Overall, the proposed Project would not result in exposure of sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site (i.e., the residences to the north of the Project site and the Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center approximately 600 feet to the west of the Project site) to substantial TAC concentrations and would not exacerbate pre-existing health risk hazards.

Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

### 3.3 (e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts related to objectionable odors. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:

PPP 3.3-5 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 “Nuisance.” Adherence to Rule 402 reduces the release of odorous emissions into the atmosphere.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

According to the South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Project proposes residential development which is a land use typically not associated with emitting objectionable odors.

Potential odor sources associated with the proposed Project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities. Standard construction requirements would minimize odor impacts from construction. The construction odor emissions would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and
would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction and is thus considered less than significant. It is expected that Project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the City’s solid waste regulations. The proposed Project would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, odors associated with the proposed Project construction and operations would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.
### 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.4(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?**

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

*Source: Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B), First Year Focused Delhi Sands Flower Loving Fly Survey (Appendix C).*
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts related to candidate, sensitive, or special status species but not to the degree that impacts would be less than significant. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.4-1 The Project is required to pay mitigation fees pursuant to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MHSCP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

Existing Conditions

The Project site is adjacent to residential development on the north, vacant land to the east and west, car storage at the southwest corner of the project site, and railroad to the south. The soils and vegetation on the proposed Project site have been disturbed historically by quarry activities, off-highway vehicle activity, illegal dumping, and recreational use. The soils on the proposed Project site are loose sands and sandy loam. The dominant plant community on the Project site is non-native annual grassland.

Plant Species

The dominant vegetation type on site is best described as non-native grassland (NNG). The NNG plant community is approximately 7.22 acres and is dominated by annual grasses (*Bromus* spp.), western ragweed (*Ambrosia psilostachya*), short pod mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), castor bean (*Ricinus communis*), Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), and tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*).

- **Brand’s Star Phacelia**: The Project site is located within MSHCP Section 6.1.3 survey area designated for the Brand’s star phacelia. This species is known to occur in sandy soils but mainly in alluvial terraces and sand dunes. This species has been observed in a sandy horse trail in Santa Ana Wilderness Area and was historically collected in Fairmont Park in the City of Riverside. There are discontinuous ephemeral drainages on the Project site and sandy soils remain even with the highly disturbed conditions. The Project site is not likely to support this plant species due to the isolation from the past natural hydrologic connection with the upper watershed and the current disturbed conditions. Focused plant surveys for the Brand’s phacelia are not required because the plant is dependent upon periodic flooding and the site is not part of an alluvial fan or flood terrace; therefore, this habitat is not present.

- **San Diego Ambrosia**: The project site is located within MSHCP Section 6.1.3 survey area designated for the San Diego ambrosia. This species is known to occur in open floodplain terraces with Garretson gravelly fine. The Project site is not likely to support this plant species because these described soils do not occur on the Project site and no playas or pools
occur. Focused plant surveys for San Diego ambrosia are not required because the site is not part of a floodplain and contains only Delhi soil.

- **San Miguel Savory**: The Project site is located within an MSHCP Section 6.1.3 survey area designated for San Miguel savory. This plant is known to occur on rocky, gabbroic, and metavolcanic substrates in oak woodland and chaparral. The project site is sandy and does not support rocky or gabbroic substrates for this plant. No chaparral or oak woodland habitat is present on the Project site, therefore focused surveys for San Miguel savory are not required.

- **Riversidean Sage Scrub**: RSS is considered a sensitive plant community by natural resource agencies because it provides habitat for listed and sensitive plant and wildlife species endemic to southern California. The Project site supports 0.44 acre of RSS dominated by California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), brittlebush (*Encelia farinosa*), California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*), and deerweed (*Lotus scoparius*). The RSS vegetation community has reestablished on the decommissioned quarry and rail yard.

**Conclusion**: The Project does not provide habitat for regional listed plant species or MSHCP plant species of concern in the NEPSSA due to the lack of suitable soil, water, and land use suitability. No further action is required.

**Wildlife Species**

Common wildlife species were observed during the various surveys. The lack of wildlife diversity is likely due to human disturbance and the non-native grassland that has taken over the site’s native vegetation.

- **Coastal California Gnatcatcher**: CAGN, a federal listed as threatened species, was incidentally observed foraging during the 2018 field surveys. Figure 8 of Appendix B shows CAGN from 2006 and the CAGN critical habitat areas. The CAGN observed during the 2018 Highland Park 2 field surveys occurred in the general vicinity of the 2006 observations. The Project site supports approximately 0.44 acre of RSS habitat, which is suitable foraging habitat although this edge of the RSS may not be used for nesting.

- **Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly**: Focused surveys for DSF, a federal listed as endangered species, are required by the USFWS and the MSHCP Section 9.0 Species Conservation Objectives due to the presence of Delhi sands soils on the Project site. The entire Project site comprises mapped soils are Delhi fine sand, 2 to 15 percent slopes, wind-eroded (DaD2), as shown in Figure 2 in Appendix B. Surveys began in July 2018 and will be completed after the summer survey period of July 2019. This species is unlikely to be present due to the high degree of disturbance by the historical quarry operation and the contemporary off-roading and dumping. However, since the July 2019 survey has not been done, the following mitigation measure is required:

**MM-BIO-1: July 2019 Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Survey**: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Survey shall be conducted pursuant to the *Interim General Survey Guidelines for the Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly* (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, December 30, 1996) and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department. In order to issue a grading permit, the results of the survey must be negative for the presence
of the species. In the event, the species is present, the Applicant shall be required to e maintain the MSHCP in rough step. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, the funding or purchase of suitable DSF habitat, purchasing conservation credits from an existing DSF mitigation bank, and/or acquiring and funding of habitat restoration.

- **Burrowing Owl:** The Project site is within the MSHCP burrowing owl focused survey area. Potential habitat for burrowing owl occurs throughout portions of the study area. Focused burrowing owl were conducted in May and June of 2018. The species was found to be absent from the project site. Since burrowing owls can quickly occupy a site, a pre-construction survey is still recommended to confirm absence before ground-disturbing activities commence as required by Mitigation Measure BIO-2 below.

**MM-BIO-2: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey.** Within 30 calendar days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of the Project’s proposed impact footprint and make a determination regarding the presence or absence of the burrowing owl. The determination shall be documented in a report and shall be submitted, reviewed, and accepted by the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit and subject to the following provisions:

a. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies no burrowing owls in the impact area, a grading permit may be issued without restriction.

b. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies the presence of burrowing owl, then prior to the issuance of a grading permit and prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities on the property, the qualified biologist shall follow the methods recommended by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW, 2012) and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP, 2006) for passive or active relocation of burrowing owls. Passive relocation, including the required use of one-way doors to exclude owls from the site and the collapsing of burrows, will occur if the biologist determines that the proximity and availability of alternate habitat is suitable for successful passive relocation. Passive relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. If proximate alternate habitat is not present as determined by the biologist, active relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. The biologist shall provide evidence in writing to the Planning Department that the species has fledged or been relocated prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

The Project site does not fall within a survey area for sensitive amphibian or mammal species covered under the MSHCP, or for any listed as threatened or endangered mammal species. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-2, the Project will not 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.

**3.4(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?**
**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B).*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

No riparian habitat is present on site. No vernal pool indicator soils or plants occur within the Project site. The Project site is not located within Federal Designated Critical Habitat. No further action is required.

**3.4(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?*

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**

*Source: Delineation of Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters (Appendix D).*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

The proposed Project site was surveyed on December 18, 2017. A routine wetland delineation was conducted and areas of potential jurisdiction were evaluated using the *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory 1987; hereafter 1987 Manual), *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region* (USACE 2008; hereafter *Regional Supplement*). Other reference materials included the current wetland indicator plant list (Lichvar and Kartesz 2014), current hydric soils list and criteria (U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] 2010), *Field Guide to Identification of the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) in the Arid West Region of the Western United States* (USACE 2008; hereafter 2008 OHWM Field Guide), and the CWA Guidance for implementing *Rapanos* and *Carabell Cases* (USACE 2007). The study area was also delineated for any areas that would be subject to potential CDFW jurisdiction based on current CDFW definitions and guidance.
The land southeast of the project site is part of the adjacent project (Highland Park TTM No. 31894), which was surveyed for potential jurisdictional waters/wetlands on March 16, 2016, and described in the Delineation of Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters Report for the Highland Park Residential Project dated October 7, 2016. The USACE determined in an Approved Jurisdictional Determination letter, dated May 31, 2017 (File No. SPL-2016-00406), that waters of the United States do not occur on the adjacent project. Therefore, the rills and swales in the Highland Park 2 (TTM No. 37470) Proposed Project above the lower southwest corner of the adjacent project are also not jurisdictional waters of the U.S.

Non-Jurisdictional Waters: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The rills and swales within the proposed Project site are isolated from any downstream connection to traditional navigable waters (TNWs) and tributaries. The total length and area for all the non-jurisdictional erosion features with bed and bank are 746 linear feet and 0.02 acre within the proposed Project site.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife Jurisdiction

The rills and swales on the proposed Project site are located in disturbed land mostly covered by nonnative annual grassland. No riparian/riverine scrub or woodland habitat is present on the Project site. The CDFW can extend jurisdiction over both disturbed and natural streambeds irrespective of whether there is connectivity to a downstream watercourse. The CDFW may not assert jurisdiction over the 0.02 acre of rills and swales since the contribution of downstream functions and values is negligible, because runoff remains on site, and the historic natural drainage area has been contained within Line A as part of the Sierra Estates residential subdivision north of the proposed Project.

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board

The Applicant will discuss with the RWQCB the request for a waste discharge order because it is expected that the USACE will rely upon the Approved Non-Jurisdictional Determination and decline to assert jurisdiction over these erosion features on the proposed project.

Conclusions

Based on the data collected and analyzed, LSA, the applicants’ biologist, delineated 746 linear feet of streambed totaling 0.02 acre within the proposed Project site. The total quantity comprises a few individual erosional features within a vacant parcel. The USACE may determine that waters of the United States do not occur on the proposed Project site. The CDFW may not require the proposed project to obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA). The RWQCB may issue a waste discharge order for the proposed project, since they issued WDO No. R8-2017-0020 for the adopted Highland Park Project (TTM 31894), the adjacent project) to comply with water quality standards.

However, as noted on page 15 of the Delineation of Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters (Appendix C)…” The results presented in this report should be considered preliminary until verified by the USACE and CDFW. These agencies will make the final determination on the respective jurisdictional areas.”
Although it appears that the data supports a determination that the features on the Project site are not jurisdictional under USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB criteria, in the absence of a final determination from these regulatory agencies, the following mitigation measures are required to be conservative and to ensure jurisdictional waters are not impacted.

**MM BIO-3. Coordination With Regulatory Agencies.** Prior to the issuance of grading permit, the applicant shall contact the United State Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to positively determine whether or not either agency wishes to exert jurisdiction of the onsite drainage features. If either agency decides to exert jurisdiction, Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5 shall be implemented.

**BIO-4. Federal Jurisdiction.** If federal jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-3, the following shall be implemented: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 Nation-Wide Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) and compensate for the loss of 746 linear feet of streambed totaling 0.02 acre at a ratio of not less than 3:1 onsite or not less than 2:1 for permanent impacts, and a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). These permits will address impacts to identified jurisdictional resources on the Project site and appropriate offsite mitigation such as such as the Santa Ana Watershed Project Area (SAWPA), Prado Basin, or an appropriate nearby downstream established mitigation bank area. The developer shall implement this measure to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department.

No USACE mitigation will be required and this mitigation measure may be waived for the proposed Project, if the applicant provides written evidence to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department that the USACE will rely upon the Highland Park (TTM No. 31893) Approved Jurisdictional Determination. The adjacent project also has a waste discharge order, dated May 1, 2017 (Adoption of Order No. RS-2017-0020). The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) will likely issue a waste discharge order for the proposed project, if the USACE makes a non-jurisdictional determination.

**BIO-5. CDFW Jurisdiction.** If state jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-3, the following shall be implemented: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project applicant shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The following shall be incorporated into the permitting, subject to approval by the regulatory agencies: (a) Replacement and/or restoration of jurisdictional "waters of the State" within the Santa Ana River watershed for 746 linear feet of streambed totaling 0.02 acre at a ratio of not less than 3:1 onsite or not less than 2:1 for permanent impacts; (b) The applicant shall restore any onsite or offsite temporary impact areas to pre-project conditions and revegetate where applicable; and (c) Off-site mitigation may occur on land acquired for the purpose of in-perpetuity preservation, or through the purchase of mitigation credits at an agency approved off-site mitigation bank or within an agency-accepted off-site permittee responsible mitigation area such as the Santa Ana Watershed Project Area (SAWPA), Prado Basin, or an appropriate nearby downstream established mitigation bank area.

No CDFW mitigation will be required and this mitigation measure may be waived for the proposed Project, if the applicant provides written evidence to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department that the CDFW does not respond to the streambed alteration notification, then the proposed Project can proceed 60 days after the CDFW states the application is complete or after receiving a CDFW Operation of Law letter.
With implementation of Mitigations BIO-3 through BIO-5, impacts would be less than significant.

### 3.4(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?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**  
*Source: Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B)*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

The Project site is bounded by existing development to the north, south, and west. An adopted specific plan project is planned for the land to the east. Therefore, the Project site in its current condition is an in-fill project. The Project site is not part of a County or statewide regional trail or wildlife corridor plan. The Project site does not provide movement cover, foraging, or shelter and is not suitable as a local wildlife movement corridor. No further action is required.

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

**Determination: No Impact.**  
*Source: Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B)*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

There are no trees located on the Project site.

### 3.4(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?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**
Impact Analysis

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to conflicting with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. This measure would be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.4-1 The Project is required to pay mitigation fees pursuant to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MHSCP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

The Project site is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The MSHCP, a regional Habitat Conservation Plan was adopted on June 17, 2003. The intent of the MSHCP is to preserve native vegetation and meet the habitat needs of multiple species, rather than focusing preservation efforts on one species at a time. The MSHCP provides coverage (including take authorization for listed species) for special-status plant and animal species, as well as mitigation for impacts to sensitive species.

Based on the analysis under Issues 3.4 (a) through 3.4 (d) above:

- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area for riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools.
- The Project will not impact Narrow Endemic Plant Species.
- The Project site does not contain suitable soils to support the Delhi Sand Flower-Loving Fly.
- The Project site is not required to comply with the Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines.
- Burrowing owl habitat exists on the site. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 (30-day Pre-Construction Survey) is required:

With implementation of PPP 3.4-1 and Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, impacts related to conflicts with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan are less than significant.
3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Source: Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix E).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Historic resources generally consist of buildings, structures, improvements, and remnants associated with a significant historic event or person(s) and/or have a historically significant style, design, or achievement. Damaging or demolition of historic resources is typically considered to be a significant impact. Impacts to historic resources can occur through direct impacts, such as destruction or removal, and indirect impacts, such as a change in the setting of a historic resource.

CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a) clarifies that historical resources include the following:

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.
2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements [of] section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code.

3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.

Results of the January 12, 2018, records search at the EIC indicate there are no previously recorded resources within the Project site; however, the Project site has never been surveyed. The January 12, 2018, field survey revealed approximately 90 percent of the Project site is obscured and very little of the original surface remains exposed. There was virtually complete obstruction by vegetation, and ground visibility was exceptionally poor at approximately 10 percent.

A concentration of discarded asphalt and a stockpile of imported soil were noted in the northern portion of the site. Building and road debris (brick, concrete block, and asphalt fragments) along with sparse modern refuse (including furniture) were also noted on the surface. The southern end of the Project site has been severely disturbed by earthmoving activities.

The January 2018 review of online historic period aerial photographs and maps and online research indicated there were never any buildings or structures within Project site and agricultural cultivation was not conspicuous.

Based on the analysis above, impacts to above ground historical resources are less than significant.

3.5(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

*Source: Cultural Resources Study (Appendix E).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

Archaeological sites are locations that contain resources associated with former human activities, and may contain such resources as human skeletal remains, waste from tool manufacture, tool concentrations, and/or discoloration or accumulation of soil or food remains.

A cultural resources records search, additional research, and a field survey were conducted for the Project site. Although no cultural resources were previously documented within the Project site by the records search, a quarry was in operation during the historic period on the east side of the Project site. Also, numerous prehistoric resources are documented in the immediately vicinity of

Cultural Resources
the eastern edge of the quarry. Therefore, due to the proximity of these resources, the Project site retains some potential for subsurface resources and part-time archaeological monitoring is recommended.

**MM- CR-1: Archaeological Monitoring.** A qualified archaeologist (the “Project Archaeologist”) shall be retained by the developer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Archaeologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential cultural resources by project personnel. If archaeological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Archaeologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-2 shall apply.

**MM- CR-2: Archeological Treatment Plan.** If a significant archaeological resource(s) is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). The archaeological monitor, the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented by the archaeologist to protect the identified archaeological resource(s) from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the archaeological resource(s) in accordance with current professional archaeology standards (typically this sampling level is two (2) to five (5) percent of the volume of the cultural deposit). At the completion of the laboratory analysis, any recovered archaeological resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department and the Eastern Information Center.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2, impacts will be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5(c)</th>
<th>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

*Source: Paleontological Resources Assessment (Appendix F).*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Paleontological resources are the preserved fossilized remains of plants and animals. Fossils and traces of fossils are preserved in sedimentary rock units, particularly fine to medium grained...
marine, lake, and stream deposits, such as limestone, siltstone, sandstone, or shale, and in ancient soils. They are also found in coarse-grained sediments, such as conglomerates or coarse alluvium sediments. Fossils are rarely preserved in igneous or metamorphic rock units. Fossils may occur throughout a sedimentary unit and, in fact, are more likely to be preserved subsurface, where they have not been damaged or destroyed by previous ground disturbance, amateur collecting, or natural causes such as erosion.

No significant paleontological resources were identified directly within the Project site during the field survey. However, the literature review indicates the Project site contains middle to early Pleistocene Old Alluvial Fan Deposits, Unit 1, which has high paleontological sensitivity. As such, development of this Project has the potential to impact scientifically important fossils. The following mitigation measure is required.

**MM-CR-3: Paleontological Monitoring.** A qualified paleontologist (the “Project Paleontologist”) shall be retained by the developer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Paleontologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential paleontological resources by project personnel. If paleontological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Paleontologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-4 shall apply.

**MM-CR-4: Paleontological Treatment Plan.** If a significant paleontological resource(s) is discovered on the property, in consultation with the Project proponent and the City, the qualified paleontologist shall develop a plan of mitigation which shall include salvage excavation and removal of the find, removal of sediment from around the specimen (in the laboratory), research to identify and categorize the find, curation in the find a local qualified repository, and preparation of a report summarizing the find.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-4 and CR-5, impacts are less than significant.

3.5(d) **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to disturbing human remains. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.5-1 The project is required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq.
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site does not contain a cemetery and no known formal cemeteries are located within the immediate site vicinity. As noted in the response to Issue 3.5 (a) above, the Project site has been heavily disturbed and the potential for uncovering human remains at the Project site is considered low. Nevertheless, the remote potential exists that human remains may be unearthed during grading and excavation activities associated with Project construction.

In the event that human remains are discovered during Project grading or other ground disturbing activities, the Project would be required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made by the Coroner.

If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted and the NAHC must then immediately notify the “most likely descendant(s)” of receiving notification of the discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then make recommendations within 48 hours, and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.5-1, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
### 3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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-site or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.6 (a) (1) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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.**

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Sources: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix G), Riverside County Map My County Website.*
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and no known faults underlie the site. Because there are no faults located on the Project site, there is no potential for the Project to expose people or structures to adverse effects related to ground rupture.

3.6 (a) (2) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Strong seismic ground shaking?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix G), Riverside County Map My County Website).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to seismic ground shaking. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.6-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the California Building Code to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is located in a seismically active area of Southern California and is expected to experience moderate to severe ground shaking during the lifetime of the Project. This risk is not considered substantially different than that of other similar properties in the southern California area. As a mandatory condition of Project approval, the Project would be required to construct the proposed structures in accordance with the California Building Code (CBC). The City’s Building and Safety Department would review the building plans through building plan checks, issuance of a building permit, and inspection of the building during construction, which would ensure that all required CBC seismic safety measures are incorporated into the building. Compliance with the CBC as verified by the City’s review process, would reduce impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.6-1, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
3.6 (a) (3) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix G), Riverside County Map My County Website).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to seismic ground shaking. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:

PPP 3.6-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the California Building Code to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which loose, saturated, relatively cohesion-less soil deposits lose shear strength during strong ground motions. The factors controlling liquefaction are:

- Seismic ground shaking of relatively loose, granular soils that are saturated or submerged can cause soils to liquefy and temporarily behave as a dense fluid. For liquefaction to occur, the following conditions have to occur:
  - Intense seismic shaking;
  - Presence of loose granular soils prone to liquefaction; and
  - Saturation of soils due to shallow groundwater.

Based on information obtained from the County of Riverside Map My County website, the Project site has a “moderate” potential for liquefaction. Groundwater was not encountered during any subsurface exploration as part of the geotechnical investigation conducted for the Project site to a depth of 41.5 feet. Review of California Department of Water Resources, Water Data Library 2018 online database indicates groundwater in the general site area has fluctuated from approximately 81 feet to 85 feet below the existing ground surface (Well ID Station: 34008N1173940W001).

Additionally, detailed design-level geotechnical studies and building plans pursuant to the California Building Code are required prior to approval of construction, as required by PPP 3.6-1. Compliance with the recommendations of the geotechnical study for soils conditions, is a standard practice and would be required by the City Building and Safety Department. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of the California Building Code as identified in a site specific geotechnical design would be reviewed by the City for appropriate inclusion, as part of the building plan check.
and development review process, would reduce the low potential for liquefaction to a less than significant level.

3.6 (a) (4) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Landslides?

**Determination: No Impact.**
*Source: Field Inspection.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

Generally, a landslide is defined as the downward and outward movement of loosened rock or earth down a hillside or slope. Landslides can occur either very suddenly or slowly, and frequently accompany other natural hazards such as earthquakes, floods, or wildfires. Landslides can also be induced by the undercutting of slopes during construction, improper artificial compaction, or saturation from sprinkler systems or broken water pipes.

The site is relatively flat and contains no slopes that may be subject to landslides. Therefore the site is not considered susceptible to seismically induced landslides. As such, there are no impacts.

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**
*Source: City Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.010, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls,*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts related to soil erosion. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP’s 3.91-1 through PPP 3.9-4 in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality shall apply.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*
Construction

Construction of the Project has the potential to contribute to soil erosion and the loss of topsoil. Grading and excavation activities that would be required for the proposed Project would expose and loosen topsoil, which could be eroded by wind or water.

City Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.010, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, implements the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permit, which establishes minimum stormwater management requirements and controls that are required to be implemented for construction of the proposed Project. To reduce the potential for soil erosion and the loss of topsoil, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required by the City, (as required by PPP 3.9-2). The SWPPP is required to address site-specific conditions related to specific grading and construction activities. The SWPPP would identify potential sources of erosion and sedimentation loss of topsoil during construction, identify erosion control Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce or eliminate the erosion and loss of topsoil, such as use of: silt fencing, fiber rolls, or gravel bags, stabilized construction entrance/exit, hydroseeding.

With compliance with the City Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.010, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements, and the best management practices (BMPs) in the SWPPP, construction impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

Operation

The proposed Project includes installation of landscaping throughout the Project site and areas of loose topsoil that could erode by wind or water would not exist upon operation of the proposed use. In addition, as described in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, the hydrologic features of the proposed Project have been designed to slow, filter, and retain stormwater on the Project site, which would also reduce the potential for stormwater to erode topsoil. Furthermore, pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.010, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, implementation of the Project requires a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), which would ensure that appropriate operational BMPs would be implemented to minimize or eliminate the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil to occur during operation of the Project. As a result, potential impacts related to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.9-2, impacts would be less than significant.

3.6(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 offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix G),
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to an unstable geologic unit. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.6-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the California Building Code to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Landslide

As noted in the response to Issue 3.6 (a) (4) above, the site is relatively flat and contains no slopes that may be subject to landslides. Therefore, the site is not considered susceptible to landslides.

Lateral Spreading

Lateral spreading is a term referring to landslides that commonly form on gentle slopes and that have rapid fluid-like flow horizontal movement. Most lateral spreading is caused by earthquakes but it is also caused by landslides. As noted in the response to Issue 3.6 (a) (4) above, the site is relatively flat and contains no slopes that may be subject to landslides. Therefore, the site is not considered susceptible to lateral spreading.

Subsidence

Subsidence is the downward movement of the ground caused by the underlying soil conditions. Certain soils, such as clay soils are particularly vulnerable since they shrink and swell depending on their moisture content. Subsidence is an issue if buildings or structures sink which causes damage to the building or structure. Subsidence is usually remedied by excavating the soil the depth of the underlying bedrock and then recompacting the soil so that it is able to support buildings and structures.

According to the Riverside County Map My County website, the Project site is considered “susceptible” to subsidence. However, with implementation of PPP 3.6-1, impacts would be less than significant.

Liquefaction

As noted in the response to Issue 3.6 (a) (3) above, the potential for exposure to liquefaction is not expected because the depth of groundwater is more than 41.5-feet.
Collapse occurs in saturated soils in which the space between individual particles is completely filled with water. This water exerts a pressure on the soil particles that influences how tightly the particles themselves are pressed together. The soils lose their strength beneath buildings and other structures.

As noted in the response to Issue 3.6 (a) (3) above, the Project site’s potential for exposure to collapse is considered “low” because the depth of groundwater is more than 41.5-feet. As such, impacts are less than significant.

3.6(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.

Source: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix G).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to expansive soils. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.6-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the California Building Code to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Expansive soils are those that undergo volume changes as moisture content fluctuates; swelling substantially when wet or shrinking when dry. Soil expansion can damage structures by cracking foundations, causing settlement and distorting structural elements. According to the results of the laboratory testing performed, the near-surface older alluvial soils exhibited a “negligible” to “very low” expansion potential when tested in accordance with ASTM D 4829. Design-level geotechnical plans pursuant to the California Building Code are required prior to approval of construction, as required by PPP 3.6-1. Compliance with the California Building Code is a standard practice and would be required by the City Building and Safety Department. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of the California Building Code as identified in a site specific geotechnical design would be reviewed by the City, as part of the building plan check and development review process, would ensure that potential soil stability impacts would be less than significant level.
3.6(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?*

**Determination: No Impact.**
Source: Project Application Materials.

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, Programs, applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

The Project does not propose the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. The Project would install domestic sewer infrastructure and connect to the Rubidoux Community Service District’s existing sewer conveyance and treatment system. As such, there are no impacts.
3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Source: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to greenhouse gas emissions. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.7-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, California Energy Code, prior to issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall submit showing that the Project will be constructed in compliance with the most recently adopted edition of the applicable California Building Code Title 24 requirements.

PPP 3.7-2 As required by Municipal Code Section 9.283.010, Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements, prior to the approval of landscaping plans, the Project proponent shall prepare and submit landscape plans that demonstrate compliance with this section.

PPP 3.7-3 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010 (8), the Project proponent shall comply with the California Green Building Standards.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

An individual project cannot generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to influence global climate change. The Project participates in this potential impact by its incremental contribution combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of greenhouse gases which when taken together may have a significant impact on global climate change.
A final numerical threshold for determining the significance of greenhouse gas emissions in the South Coast Air Basin has not been established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The City of Jurupa Valley is using the following as interim thresholds for small residential projects:

- Residential projects that emit less stationary source greenhouse gas emissions less than 3,000 MTCO2e per year are not considered a substantial greenhouse gas emitter and the impact is less than significant. Projects that emit in excess of 3,000 MTCO2e per year require additional analysis and mitigation.

A summary of the Project’s projected annual operational greenhouse gas emissions, including amortized construction-related emissions, is provided in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>GHG Emissions (metric tons per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Construction Emissions (amortized over 30 years)</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>150.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>339.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Usage</td>
<td>14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CO2E (All Sources)</strong></td>
<td><strong>527.98</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance Threshold</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant?</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).*

Based on guidance from the SCAQMD, if this type of project would emit GHG emissions less than 3,000 MTCO2e per year, the project is not considered a substantial GHG emitter and the GHG impact is less than significant, requiring no additional analysis and no mitigation.

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan, May 22, 2014, Western Riverside County Council of Governments Subregional Climate Action Plan, September 2014.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the project relating to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*
The Climate Change Scoping Plan was first approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in 2008 and must be updated every five years. The First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan was approved by the Board on May 22, 2014. The Climate Change Scoping Plan provides a framework for actions to reduce California’s GHG emissions, and requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and other initiatives to reduce GHGs. As such, the Climate Change Scoping Plan is not directly applicable to the Projects in many cases. The Project is not in conflict with the Climate Change Scoping Plan because its individual greenhouse gas emissions are below screening thresholds as noted in the response to Issue 3.7 (a) above and the Project will implement such greenhouse reduction measures Water Efficient Landscaping, Title 24 Energy Efficiency Requirements, and recycling and waste reduction requirements.

In addition, the City of Jurupa Valley is a participant in the Western Riverside County Council of Governments Subregional Climate Action Plan (WRCOG Subregional CAP). The specific goals and actions included in the WRCOG Subregional CAP that are applicable to the proposed Project include those pertaining to energy and water use reduction, promotion of green building measures, waste reduction, and reduction in vehicle miles traveled. The proposed Project would also be required to include all mandatory green building measures for new developments under the CALGreen Code, as required by the City Municipal Code Section 8.05.010 (8), which would require that the new buildings reduce water consumption, employ building commissioning to increase building system efficiencies, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant emitting finish materials. In addition, the City's requires that all landscaping comply with water efficient landscaping requirements.

The implementation of these stricter building and appliance standards would result in water, energy, and construction waste reductions for the proposed Project. In addition, as described above, the proposed Project would not exceed the GHG thresholds. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases with implementation of PPP 3.7-1 through 3.7-3.
### 3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

3.8(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?**
Determination: Less than Significant Impact.
Source: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix H).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.8-1  As required by General Plan Policy CSSF 1.31-Federal/State Laws. Comply with federal and state laws regarding the management of hazardous waste and materials.

Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Existing Conditions

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the Project site in accordance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-13 has revealed no evidence of recognized environmental conditions in connection with the Project site.

Construction Activities

Heavy equipment that would be used during construction of the proposed Project would be fueled and maintained by substances such as oil, diesel fuel, gasoline, hydraulic fluid, and other liquid materials that would be considered hazardous if improperly stored or handled. In addition, materials such as paints, roofing materials, solvents, and other substances typically used in building construction would be located on the Project site during construction. Improper use, storage, or transportation of hazardous materials could result in accidental releases or spills, potentially posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment. The potential for accidental releases and spills of hazardous materials during construction is a standard risk on all construction sites, and there would be no greater risk for improper handling, transportation, or spills associated with future development that would be a reasonably consequence of the proposed Project than would occur on any other similar construction site.

Construction contractors are required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials, including but not limited requirements imposed by the Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, South Coast Air Quality Management District, and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. As such, impacts due to construction activities would not cause a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. A less than significant impact would occur.
Operational Activities

The Project site would be developed with residential land uses which is a land use not typically associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Although residential land uses may utilize household products that contain toxic substances, such as cleansers, paints, adhesives, and solvents, these products are usually in low concentration and small in amount and would not pose a significant risk to humans or the environment during transport to/from or use at the Project site.

Pursuant to State law and local regulations, residents would be required to dispose of household hazardous waste (e.g., batteries, used oil, old paint) at a permitted household hazardous waste collection facility. Accordingly, the Project would not expose people or the environment to significant hazards associated with the disposal of hazardous materials at the Project site. Long-term operation of the Project would not expose the public or the environment to significant hazards associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is not located within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school in Nueva Vista Continuation School located approximately 0.50 miles west of the Project site. As discussed in the responses to issues 3.8 (b) and 3.8 (b) above, the all hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local agencies and regulations with respect to hazardous materials. As such, impacts are less than significant.

3.8(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?

Determination: No Impact.
Sources: DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List,) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix H).
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As such, no impact would occur.

3.8(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?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is located approximately 1.5 miles northwest of the Flabob Airport. According to Map FL-1, Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Project site is not located within a Compatibility Zone of the Flabob Airport Influence Area. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

3.8(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?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Google Earth. Site Reconnaissance.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.
The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, no impact would occur.

### 3.8(g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**Determination:** No Impact.  
*Sources: General Plan Safety Element, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Access to the Project site is proposed from 30th Street which are paved roadway and would be further improved by the Project. The Project site does not contain any emergency facilities nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route. During construction and long-term operation, the Project would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles from 30th Street and connecting roadways as required by the City. Furthermore, the Project would not result in a substantial alteration to the design or capacity of any public road that would impair or interfere with the implementation of evacuation procedures. Because the Project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, impacts are less than significant.

### 3.8 (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?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.  
*Source: General Plan Figure 8-11.*

**Impact Analysis**

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

PPP 3.14-1 The Project applicant shall comply with all applicable Riverside County Fire Department codes, ordinances, and standard conditions regarding fire prevention and suppression measures relating to water improvement plans, fire hydrants, automatic fire extinguishing systems, fire access, access gates, combustible construction, water availability, and fire sprinkler systems.
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to General Plan Figure 8-11: Wildfire Severity Zones in Jurupa Valley, the Project site is shown as being in a "Moderate" fire hazard area. The Project would be conditioned by the City to provide a minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities, including compliance with State and local fire codes. As such, development of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires and impacts would be less than significant.
## 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 offsite?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Tentative Tract Map 37470, Preliminary WQMP (Appendix I).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating water quality and waste discharge requirements. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

**PPP 3.9-1** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (1)*, any person performing construction work in the city shall comply with the provisions of this chapter, and shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer.

**PPP 3.9-2** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (2)*, any person performing construction work in the city shall be regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board in a manner pursuant to and consistent with applicable requirements contained in the General Permit No. CAS000002, State Water Resources Control Board Order Number 2009-0009-DWQ. The city may notify the State Board of any person performing construction work that has a non-compliant construction site per the General Permit.

**PPP 3.9-3** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section C*, new development or redevelopment projects shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any deterioration of water quality that would impair subsequent or competing uses of the water. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer. The BMPs may include, but are not limited to, the following and may, among other things, require new developments or redevelopments to do any of the following:

1. Increase permeable areas by leaving highly porous soil and low lying area undisturbed by:
   
   (a) Incorporating landscaping, green roofs and open space into the project design;
(b) Using porous materials for or near driveways, drive aisles, parking stalls and low volume roads and walkways; and

c) Incorporating detention ponds and infiltration pits into the project design.

(2) Direct runoff to permeable areas by orienting it away from impermeable areas to swales, berms, green strip filters, gravel beds, rain gardens, pervious pavement or other approved green infrastructure and French drains by:

(a) Installing rain-gutters oriented towards permeable areas;

(b) Modifying the grade of the property to divert flow to permeable areas and minimize the amount of storm water runoff leaving the property; and

c) Designing curbs, berms or other structures such that they do not isolate permeable or landscaped areas.

(3) Maximize storm water storage for reuse by using retention structures, subsurface areas, cisterns, or other structures to store storm water runoff for reuse or slow release.

(4) Rain gardens may be proposed in-lieu of a water quality basin when applicable and approved by the City Engineer.

PPP 3.9-4 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section E, any person or entity that owns or operates a commercial and/or industrial facility(s) shall comply with the provisions of this chapter. All such facilities shall be subject to a regular program of inspection as required by this chapter, any NPDES permit issued by the State Water Resource Control Board, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Wat. Code Section 13000 et seq.), Title 33 U.S.C. Section 1251 et seq. (Clean Water Act), any applicable state or federal regulations promulgated thereto, and any related administrative orders or permits issued in connection therewith.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

The following feature proposed by the Project is incorporated into the Project's design and is intended to reduce or avoid impacts to hydrology and water quality. This feature will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PDF 3.9-1 The Project will provide a water quality basin with a design capture volume (DCV) sufficient to retain all stormwater runoff for percolation into the groundwater. The detention basins will provide water quality treatment during percolation.
Construction Impacts

Construction of the Project would involve clearing, grading, paving, utility installation, building construction, and the installation of landscaping, which would result in the generation of potential water quality pollutants such as silt, debris, chemicals, paints, and other solvents with the potential to adversely affect water quality. As such, short-term water quality impacts have the potential to occur during construction of the Project in the absence of any protective or avoidance measures.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City of Jurupa Valley, the Project would be required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Municipal Stormwater Permit for construction activities. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit is required for all Projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area.

In addition, the Project would be required to comply with the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program. Compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit and the Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program involves the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for construction-related activities, including grading. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan would specify the Best Management Practices that the Project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are prevented, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property.

Operational Impacts

Storm water pollutants commonly associated with the type of land uses that could occupy the proposed buildings include sediment/turbidity, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen-demanding substances, organic compounds, bacteria and viruses, oil and grease, and pesticides.

Pursuant to the requirements of the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit, a Water Quality Management Plan is required for managing the quality of storm water or urban runoff that flows from a developed site after construction is completed and the facilities or structures are occupied and/or operational. A Water Quality Management Plan describes the Best Management Practices that will be implemented and maintained throughout the life of a project to prevent and minimize water pollution that can be caused by storm water or urban runoff.

Impervious areas shall be discharged into adjacent landscaped areas, where feasible, and all onsite area is discharged into the onsite bioretention basin before leaving the Project site. Treatment of first flush waters from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed on-site water quality basin.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.9-1 through PPP 3.9-4, impacts would be less than significant.
3.9(b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Sources: Tentative Tract Map 37470, Preliminary WQMP (Appendix I).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is located within the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD). The JCSD Board of Directors approved a “no contest” action that supports the de-annexation of the Project site from JCSD and the annexation of the Project site to the Rubidoux Community Services District. As such, water service will be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District ("District").

According to the District’s Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the sole source of potable water supply for the District and for all water users in the Rubidoux Community is groundwater extracted from the southern portion of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin 1 (also referred to herein as the Riverside Basin) of the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin. The Basin encompasses the District’s entire service area. The District expects that groundwater extracted from the Basin by six potable and six non-potable (irrigation only) groundwater wells will continue to be its primary (and possibly only) source of water through the year 2040, and possibly beyond.

The Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin is adjudicated, as set forth in Judgment No. 78426 (also referred to herein as the Basin Judgment). According to Section IX(b) of the Basin Judgment, entered April 17, 1969, "over any five-year period, there may be extracted from such Basin Area, without replenishment obligation, an amount equal to five times such annual average for the Basin Area; provided, however, that if extractions in any year exceed such average by more than 20 percent, Western [Western Municipal Water District] shall provide replenishment in the following year equal to the excess extractions over such 20 percent peaking allowance."

In August 2015, DWR released a draft list of 21 groundwater basins and subbasins significantly overdrafted by "excessive" pumping in response to a series of executive orders issued by Governor Brown since January 2014. The Riverside-Arlington Subbasin was not included in this list. DWR published the final list in January 2016, with no changes to the designation of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin.
Development of the Project would increase impervious surface coverage on the site which would in turn reduce the amount of direct infiltration of runoff into the ground. This would have a less than significant impact on groundwater recharge in the areas of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin 1 that are managed for that purpose, since those recharge areas do not encompass the Project site.

According to a review of California Department of Water Resources, Water Data Library 2018 online database indicates groundwater in the general site area has fluctuated from approximately 81 feet to 85 feet below the existing ground surface (Well ID Station: 34008N1173940W001).

Based on the above analysis, impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

3.9(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 offsite?

3.9(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 offsite?

3.9(e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.
Sources: Tentative Tract Map 37470, Preliminary WQMP (Appendix I).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

Refer to PPP 3.9-1 through 3.9-4 under Issue 3.9 (a) above.

Project Design Features (PDF)

Refer to PDF 3.9-1 under Issue 3.9 (a) above.

The Project site currently drains from north to south, and these existing drainage patterns will be conserved. Impervious areas shall be discharged into adjacent landscaped areas, where feasible, and all onsite area will be discharged into the onsite bioretention basin before leaving the Project site.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.9-1 through 3.9-4, impacts would be less than significant with respect to Issues 3.9 (c), 3.9 (d), and 3.9 (e) above and no mitigation measures are required.
3.9(f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Tentative Tract Map 37470, Preliminary WQMP (Appendix I).

Impact Analysis

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

Refer to PPP 3.9-1 through 3.9-4 under Issue 3.9 (a) above.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

Refer to PDF 3.9-1 under Issue 3.9 (a) above.

There are no conditions associated with the proposed Project that could result in the substantial degradation of water quality beyond what is described above in response to Issues 3.9 (a), 3.9(c), and 3.9 (e) above.

3.9(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?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: General Plan Figure 8-9.

Impact Analysis

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to General Plan Figure 8-9: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the Project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

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

Determination: No Impact.
Source: General Plan Figure 8-9.

Impact Analysis
Hydrology and Water Quality

There are no Plans, Policies, Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to General Plan Figure 8-9: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the Project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

3.9(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?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: General Plan Figure 8-9.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to General Plan Figure 8-9: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the Project site is not located within an area that may be exposed to the failure of a levee or a dam. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

3.9(j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Determination: No Impact.
Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Pacific Ocean is located more than 30 miles from the Project site; consequently, there is no potential for tsunamis to impact the Project. In addition, no steep hillsides subject to mudflow are located on or near the Project site. The nearest large body of surface water to the site is Lake
Mathews, located approximately 12 miles to the south. Due to the distance of Lake Mathews from the Project site, a seiche in Lake Mathews would have no impact on the Project. Therefore, the Project site would not be subject to inundation by a seiche, mudflow, and/or tsunami. Therefore, no impact would occur.
3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10(a) Physically divide an established community?

Determination: No Impact.

Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.

Impact Analysis

Plants, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

An example of a Project that has the potential to divide an established community includes the construction of a new freeway or highway through an established neighborhood. The Project is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. Land uses surrounding to the north are 30th Street with single-family homes further to the north, to the south are railroad tracks with Canal Street and single-family homes further to the south, to the east is vacant land, and to the west is vacant land with Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center, single-family residences, and a vehicle storage facility further to the west. Therefore, no impacts would occur with respect to dividing an established community.
3.10(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?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: General Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan, Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board's Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program Project Application Materials

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The applicable plans and policies relating to a 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, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect are described in the analysis below.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Although the Project proposes a change of zone form R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One Family Dwellings), the Project is still consistent with the General Plan Land Use Designation of MDR (Medium Density Residential) which allows development on the Project site with a density range of 2-5 dwelling units per acre. The Project is proposed at a density of 5.0 dwelling units per acre.

As demonstrated throughout this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Project would otherwise not conflict with any applicable goals, objectives, and policies of the City of Jurupa General Plan or the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. Additionally, the Project would not conflict with any applicable policy document, including the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board's Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program, the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Air Quality Management Plan, and the Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The purpose of these plans are to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect.

In conclusion, the Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating adverse environmental effects and impacts are less than significant with implementation of all of the Plans, Policies, and Programs identified in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
Source: Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B),
Impact Analysis

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to a conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. This measure would be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.4-1 The Project is required to pay mitigation fees pursuant to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MHSCP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The MSHCP, a regional Habitat Conservation Plan, was adopted on June 17, 2003. The intent of the MSHCP is to preserve native vegetation and meet the habitat needs of multiple species, rather than focusing preservation efforts on one species at a time. The MSHCP provides coverage (including take authorization for listed species) for special-status plant and animal species, as well as mitigation for impacts to sensitive species.

Based on the analysis under Issues 3.4 (a) through 3.4 (d) (*Biological Resources*):

- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area for riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools.
- The Project will not impact Narrow Endemic Plant Species.
- The Project site does not contain suitable soils to support the Delhi Sand Flower-Loving Fly.
- The Project site is not required to comply with the Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines.
- Burrowing owl habitat exists on the site. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 (30-day Pre-Construction Survey) is required:

With implementation of PPP 3.4-1 and Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-2, impacts related to conflicts with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan are less than significant.
3.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.11(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?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: General Plan.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)
There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to General Plan Figure 4-16: Jurupa Valley Mineral Resources, the Project site is mapped within MRZ-3, which is defined as "Areas containing known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resources significance." No mineral resource extraction activity is known to have ever occurred on the Project site. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State of California. Therefore, no impact would occur.

3.11(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?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: General Plan.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)
There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to General Plan Figure 4-16: Jurupa Valley Mineral Resources, the Project site is mapped within MRZ-3, which is defined as “Areas containing known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resources significance.” However, no mineral resource extraction activity is known to have ever occurred on the Project site. As such, impacts are less than significant.
### 3.12 NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.12(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?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

*Source: Noise and Vibration Impact Analysis (Appendix J).*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to noise but not to the degree that impacts would be less than significant. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

- **PPP 3.12-1** As required by Municipal Code Section 11.05.020 (9), private construction projects located within one-quarter (¼) of a mile from an inhabited dwelling shall not perform construction between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and six (6:00) a.m. during
the months of June through September and between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and seven (7:00) a.m. during the months of October through May.

PPP 3.12-2 As required by Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 11.05.040, no person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1 of this section or that violates the special sound source standards set forth in Section 11.05.060.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Existing Ambient Noise Environment

Sources that dominate the existing noise environment include traffic on 30th Street and distant traffic on SR 60, as well as parking lot impacts west of the Project site.

Construction Noise

The proposed Project would require the use of heavy-duty, off-road construction equipment throughout development activities. Since project specific information is not available at this time, potential construction-related noise impacts can only be evaluated based on the typical construction activities associated with industrial development. Potential construction source noise levels were developed based on methodologies, reference noise levels, and equipment usage and other operating factors documented and contained in the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Construction Noise Handbook (FHWA, 2010), Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment document (FTA, 2006), and Caltrans' Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual (Caltrans, 2013).

Project construction activities would include: staging, site preparation (e.g., land clearing), grading, utility trenching, foundation work (e.g., excavation, pouring concrete pads), material deliveries, building construction (e.g., framing, concrete pouring, welding), paving, coating application, and site finishing work. In general, these activities would involve the use of worker vehicles, delivery trucks, dump trucks, and heavy-duty construction equipment such as (but not limited to) backhoes, tractors, loaders, graders, excavators, rollers, cranes, material lifts, generators, and air compressors. Table 12 presents the noise levels associated with typical types of construction equipment that could be used to develop the Project.

With regard to construction noise, site preparation and grading phases typically result in the highest temporary noise levels due to the use of heavy-duty equipment such as dozers, excavators, graders, loaders, scrapers, and trucks. As shown in Table 11, the worst-case Leq and Lmax noise levels associated with the operation of a dozer, excavator, scraper, etc. are predicted to be approximately 82 and 85 dBA, respectively, at a distance of 50 feet from the equipment operating area. At an active construction site, it is not uncommon for two or more pieces of construction equipment to operate at the same time and in close proximity. The concurrent operation of two or more pieces of construction equipment would result in noise levels of approximately 85 to 88 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from equipment operating areas. These maximum noise levels would occur for a short period time; as site preparation and grading is completed and building construction
begins, work activities would occur further from property lines and generate lower construction noise levels.

### Table 12. Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels (dBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Reference Noise Level at 50 feet (Lmax)</th>
<th>50 Feet</th>
<th>100 Feet</th>
<th>150 Feet</th>
<th>250 Feet</th>
<th>350 Feet</th>
<th>450 Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact Roller</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Truck</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Caltrans, 2013, FHWA, 2010

dBA: Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The A-weighting scale is an adjustment to the actual sound pressure levels to be consistent with that of human hearing response.

Lmax: The RMS (root mean squared) maximum level of a noise source or environment where peak is the maximum level of the raw noise source.

Leq: The method to describe sound levels that vary over time, resulting in a single decibel value which takes into account the total sound energy over the period of time of interest.

Per Section 11.05.020 (9) of the Municipal Code, construction activities occurring between the hours of 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September and between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of October through May are exempt from noise standards.

Regardless of the Project’s consistency with the Municipal Code as described above, construction activities on the Project site, especially those involving heavy equipment, would result in noise levels up to 88 dBA during grading which would exceed the exterior noise level for residential uses.
Noise

Page 84

of 55 dBA CNEL. The following mitigation measure is required to reduce construction noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible:

Mitigation Measure

**Mitigation Measure NOI-1-Construction Noise Mitigation Plan.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the developer is required to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the City Planning Department for review and approval. The plan must depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project. In addition, the plan shall require that the following notes are included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by City of Jurupa Valley staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.

"a) Haul truck deliveries shall be limited to between the hours of 6:00am to 6:00pm during the months of June through September and 7:00am to 6:00pm during the months of October through May.

b) Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards.

c) All stationary construction equipment shall be placed in such a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from any sensitive receptors adjacent to the Project site.

d) Construction equipment staging areas shall be located the greatest distance between the staging area and the nearest sensitive receptors."

Per Section 11.05.020 (9) of the Municipal Code, construction activities occurring between the hours of 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September and between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of October through May are exempt from noise standards.

Operational Noise

The Project is proposed to consist of 34 single-family detached residential lots and the only potential for the Project to create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels would be from future traffic generated by the proposed homes. The proposed Project is expected to generate approximately 324 average daily vehicle trips (26 trips in the AM Peak hours and 34 trips in the PM Peak hours) which will not noticeably increase ambient noise levels in the Project area. Typically, a doubling of traffic volumes is required to result in an increase of 3 dBA, which is considered to be a barely audible change. Project generated traffic will not result in a doubling of traffic volumes along any affected roadway segment. As such, the proposed Project traffic would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient roadway noise levels. Off-site transportation-related noise impacts created by the Project would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

**3.12(b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Noise and Vibration Impact Analysis (Appendix J).*
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Construction Vibration

Under existing conditions, there are no known sources of ground-borne vibration or noise emanating from the Project site. The Project will not employ any pile driving, rock blasting, or rock crushing equipment during construction activities, which are the primary sources of ground-borne noise and vibration during construction.

The City has relied upon vibration standards promulgated by Caltrans in past CEQA documents. (California Department of Transportation, Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. September, 2013). According to Caltrans, the threshold at which there may be a risk of architectural damage to normal houses with plastered walls and ceilings is 0.20 PPV inch/second. Primary sources of vibration during construction would be bulldozers. A large bulldozer could produce up to 0.089 PPV at 25 feet. At a distance of 15 feet a bulldozer would yield a worst-case 0.027 PPV (inch/sec) which is within the threshold of perception and below any risk or architectural damage.

There are single family residences located near the Project site. The level of anticipated vibration does not exceed 0.20 PPV inch/second. As such, vibration would not result in the excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Operational Vibration

Typically, groundborne vibration sources that could potentially affect nearby properties are from rail roads and trucks traveling at higher speeds on freeways and highways. The Project does not have rail access nor is it a major transportation facility or roadway. Therefore, the operational impacts associated with ground-borne vibration would be less than significant at nearby sensitive uses.

3.12(c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

Refer to PPP 3.12-1 and PPP 3.12-2 under Issue 3.12(a) above.
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

As discussed above under Issue 3.12(a), with implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1, impacts would be less than significant.

**3.12(d)**  
*A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?*

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.  
*Source: Noise and Vibration Impact Analysis (Appendix J).*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

Refer to PPP 3.12-1 and PPP 3.12-2 under Issue 3.12(a) above.

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

As discussed above under Issue 3.12(a), the only potential for the Project to create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels is during its construction phase. The analysis presented under Issue 3.12(a) concluded that the Project would result in elevated noise levels during construction but were less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1.

**3.12 (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?*

**Determination:** No Impact.  
*Source: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to *Map FL-3, Noise Compatibility Contours*, the Project site is not located within an area that will be significantly impacted by aircraft noise. As such, the Project will not result in excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area.
3.12(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?

**Determination: No Impact.**
*Source: Google Earth, Field Inspection.*

The Project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impacts will occur.
3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.13(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)?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project would not result in substantial population growth because it only will allow up to thirty-four (34) dwelling units. According to the California Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018 Jurupa Valley has 3.35 persons per household. The increase in population would be 114 persons assuming all the future residents of the houses would come from outside the city limits.

Typically, growth would be considered a significant impact pursuant to CEQA if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services and requires the expansion or new construction of public facilities and utilities.

New water and sewer lines will connect to the existing facilities in 30th Street.

In addition, the analysis in Section 3.14, Public Services, of this Initial Study Checklist demonstrates that the impacts on public services are less than significant so the public service provider’s ability
to provide services will not be reduced. Based on the above analysis, impacts are less than significant.

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

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Sources: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

The Project site does not contain any residential housing units. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not displace a substantial number of existing housing, nor would it necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. As such, there would be no impact.

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

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

As described above under the response to Issue 3.13(b), the Project site does not contain residential housing units. Therefore, the Project would not displace substantial numbers of people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impacts would be less than significant.
3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 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, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

FIRE PROTECTION

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Riverside County Fire Department.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to fire protection. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.14-1 The Project applicant shall comply with all applicable Riverside County Fire Department codes, ordinances, and standard conditions regarding fire prevention and suppression measures relating to water improvement plans, fire hydrants,
automatic fire extinguishing systems, fire access, access gates, combustible construction, water availability, and fire sprinkler systems.

**PPP 3.14-2** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 et seq., the Project proponent shall pay a Development Impact Fee (DIF) following protocol for impact fee collection.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Riverside County Fire Department provides fire protection services to the Project area. The Project would be primarily served by the Rubidoux Fire Station No. 38, an existing station located at an existing station located approximately 2.7 roadway miles northwest of the Project site at 5721 Mission Boulevard.

Development of the Project would impact fire protection services by placing an additional demand on existing fire protection resources should its resources not be augmented. To offset the increased demand for fire protection services, the Project would be conditioned by the City to provide a minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities, including compliance with State and local fire codes, fire sprinklers, a fire hydrant system, paved access, and secondary access routes. Although the Project would increase the demand for fire protection services, it is not anticipated that it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities as the Fire Department has reviewed the Project and will provide fire protection services from existing facilities.

Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with the provisions of Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 which requires payment of the Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing for fire protection services. Payment of the Development Impact Fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional public services, including fire protection services, which may be applied to fire facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand for fire protection services that would be created by the Project.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.14-1 and PPP 3.14-2, impacts related to fire protection are less than significant.

**POLICE PROTECTION**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Riverside County Sheriff’s Department “Stations,” Riverside County General Plan, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to police protection. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:
PPP 3.14-2 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 et seq., the Project proponent shall pay a Development Impact Fee (DIF) following protocol for impact fee collection.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Riverside County Sheriff's Department provides community policing to the Project area via the Jurupa Valley Station located at 7477 Mission Boulevard, Jurupa Valley, CA. The Project would increase the demand for police protection services. The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 which requires payment of the Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing for public services, including police protection services. Payment of the Development Impact Fee would ensure that the Project provides its fair share of funds for additional police protection services, which may be applied to sheriff facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand that would be created by the Project. Although the Project would increase the demand for police protection services, it is not anticipated that it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities as the Sheriff's Department has reviewed the Project and will provide police protection services from existing facilities. As such, the Project would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact 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.

In addition, consistent with General Plan Policy CSSF 2.1-2, the Project plans were routed to the Sheriff's Department for review and comment to increase public safety and maintain close coordination with the Sheriff's Department and law enforcement programs.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.14-2, impacts related to police protection are less than significant.

SCHOOLS

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: California Senate Bill 50 (Greene), Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to schools. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.14-3 As required by Section 65995 of the Government Code, the Project Applicant shall pay required development impact fees to the applicable school district following protocol for impact fee collection required by that district.
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project proposes thirty-four (34) dwelling units which could create additional students to be served by the Jurupa Unified School District assuming future students will come from outside the District. However, the Project would be required to contribute fees to the Jurupa Unified School District in accordance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Senate Bill 50). Pursuant to Senate Bill 50, payment of school impact fees constitutes complete mitigation under CEQA for Project-related impacts to school services.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-3, impacts related to schools are less than significant.

**PARKS**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Project Application Materials*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to parks. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.14-4 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

As noted in the response to Issue 3.13 (a) above, the Project proposes thirty-four (34) dwelling units. According to the California Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018* Jurupa Valley has 3.35 persons per household. The increase in population would be 114 persons assuming all the future residents of the houses would come from outside the city limits. As such, the Project will generate additional need for parkland. The payment of development impact fees will reduce any indirect Project impacts related to parks.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-4, impacts related to parks are less than significant.

**OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Project Application Materials.*
**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to other public facilities. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.14-2 above is applicable to the Project.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

As noted in the response to Issue 3.13(a) above, development of the Project could result in a direct increase in the population of the Project area and would not increase the demand for public services, including public health services and library services which would require the construction of new or expanded public facilities.

The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 which requires payment of the Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing public services. Payment of the Development Impact Fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share of funds for additional public services. These funds may be applied to the acquisition and/or construction of public services and/or equipment.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-2 above, impacts related to other public facilities are less than significant.
3.15 RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

3.15(a) Would the proposed 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?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to other public facilities. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.14-4 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project would not result in substantial population growth because it only will allow thirty-four (34) dwelling units. According to the California Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018* Jurupa Valley has 3.35 persons per household. The increase in population would be 114 persons assuming all the future residents of the houses would come from outside the city limits. As such, the Project would not cause a substantial physical deterioration of any park facilities or would accelerate the physical deterioration of any park facilities because the Project because of the relatively small increase in population. The payment of Development Impact Fees will reduce any indirect Project impacts related to recreational facilities.
Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-1, impacts related to recreational facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

3.15(b) Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.

Source: Project Application Materials

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project does not propose any recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment. In addition, no offsite parks or recreational improvements are proposed or required as part of the Project.

Based on the analysis above, impacts related to parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
## 3.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Source: Riverside County Transportation Department, Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines.*
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to transportation/traffic. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.16-1 The Project Proponent shall make required per-unit fee payments associated with the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF) pursuant to Chapter 3.70 of the Municipal Code.

PPP 3.16-2 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, the Project is required to pay a Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing revenue that the City can use to fund transportation improvements such as roads, bridges, major improvements and traffic signals.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Motor Vehicle Analysis

The City of Jurupa Valley relies upon the Riverside County Transportation Department, Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines to determine if a project requires a traffic impact analysis to be prepared. According to the Guidelines, a traffic impact analysis is generally not required for any use that generates less than 100 vehicle trips during the peak hours. The City's Transportation Manager determined that a traffic impact analysis was not required for this Project and that impacts would be less than significant due to the low volume of traffic (estimated at 324 daily vehicle trips, 26 of which will occur during the morning peak hour and 34 of which will occur during the evening peak hour). In addition, the City's Transportation Manager determined there are no concerns over safety or operational issues associated with the Project.

Transit Service Analysis

The Riverside Transit Agency, a public transit agency, serves the region and the City of Jurupa Valley. There is no bus service adjacent to the Project site. In addition, the Project is not proposing to construct any improvements would interfere with any future bus service.

Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Analysis

The Project is not proposing to construct any improvements that will interfere with bicycle and pedestrian use. Pedestrian and bicycle access will be available to the Project site from 30th Street. Therefore, the Project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy applying to non-motorized travel. Impacts are less than significant.
3.16(b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Riverside County Congestion Management Program.

Impact Analysis

The Riverside County Transportation Commission was designated as the Congestion Management Agency for Riverside County in 1990, and therefore, prepares and administers the Riverside County Congestion Management Program in consultation with the Technical Advisory Committee which consists of local agencies, the County of Riverside, transit agencies, and subregional agencies.

The intent of the Riverside County Congestion Management Program is to more directly link land use, transportation, and air quality, thereby prompting reasonable growth management programs that will effectively utilize new transportation funds, alleviate traffic congestion and related impacts, and improve air quality.

The 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program is the latest version of the CMP prepared by the Riverside County Transportation Commission in accordance with Proposition 111, passed in June 1990. The Congestion Management Program was established in the State of California to more directly link land use, transportation, and air quality and to prompt reasonable growth management programs that would more effectively utilize new and existing transportation funds, alleviate traffic congestion and related impacts, and improve air quality. Deficiencies along the CMP system are identified by the Riverside County Transportation Commission when they occur so that improvement measures can be identified. Understanding the reason for these deficiencies and identifying ways to reduce the impact along a critical CMP corridor is intended to conserve scarce funding resources and help target those resources appropriately.

Due to the low volume of traffic (estimated at 324 daily vehicle trips, 26 of which will occur during the morning peak hour and 34 of which will occur during the evening peak hour), Project traffic will not result in significant direct and cumulatively considerable impacts to Congestion Management Program roadway system. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not conflict with the applicable Congestion Management Program, including Level of Service standards, and impacts would be less than significant.

3.16(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?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Google Earth.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.
Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project does not include an air travel component (e.g., runway, helipad, etc.). Accordingly, the Project would not have the potential to affect air traffic patterns, including an increase in traffic levels or a change in flight path location that results in substantial safety risks. Impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

All roadway improvements will be constructed to meet City standards. The Project would not be incompatible with existing development in the surrounding area to the extent that it would create a transportation hazard as a result of an incompatible use. Accordingly, the Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

3.16(e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project proposes thirty-four (34) residential homes which would increase the need for emergency access to-and-from the site. Adequate emergency access would be provided to the...
Project site from 30th Street and Sierra Avenue. During the course of the preliminary review of the Project, the Project’s transportation design was reviewed by the City’s Engineering Department, County Fire Department, and County Sheriff’s Department to ensure that adequate access to and from the site would be provided for emergency vehicles.

With the adherence to mandatory requirements for emergency vehicle access, there are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

3.16(f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

**Determination: No Impact.**

_Source: General Plan Circulation Element, Project Application Materials._

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

The Riverside Transit Agency, a public transit agency, serves the region and the City of Jurupa Valley. In addition, the Project is not proposing to construct any improvements would interfere with any future bus service. As such, the Project as proposed will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy applying to transit services. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.
3.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.17(a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

Determination: No Impact.

Source: Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix E), AB52 Tribal Consultation.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Historic resources generally consist of buildings, structures, improvements, and remnants associated with a significant historic event or person(s) and/or have a historically significant style, design, or achievement. Damaging or demolition of historic resources is typically considered to be a significant impact. Impacts to historic resources can occur through direct impacts, such as destruction or removal, and indirect impacts, such as a change in the setting of a historic resource.

CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a) clarifies that historical resources include the following:

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.
2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements [of] section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code.

3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.

Results of the January 12, 2018, records search at the EIC indicate there are no previously recorded resources within the Project site; however, the Project site has never been surveyed. The January 12, 2018, field survey revealed approximately 90 percent of the Project site is obscured and very little of the original surface remains exposed. There was virtually complete obstruction by vegetation, and ground visibility was exceptionally poor at approximately 10 percent.

A concentration of discarded asphalt and a stockpile of imported soil were noted in the northern portion of the site. Building and road debris (brick, concrete block, and asphalt fragments) along with sparse modern refuse (including furniture) were also noted on the surface. The southern end of the Project site has been severely disturbed by earthmoving activities.

The January 2018 review of online historic period aerial photographs and maps and online research indicated there were never any buildings or structures within Project site and agricultural cultivation was not conspicuous.

Based on the analysis above, impacts to above ground historical resources are less than significant.

3.17(b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Determination: Potentially Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Source: Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix E), AB52 Tribal Consultation.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

On July 1, 2015 AB 52 (Gatto, 2014) went into effect. AB 52 established "Tribal Cultural resources" as a resource subject to CEQA review. Tribal Cultural Resources are either of the following:

(1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
(A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.

(B) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.

(2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

AB 52 also created a process for consultation with California Native American Tribes in the CEQA process. Tribal Governments can request consultation with a lead agency and give input into potential impacts to tribal cultural resources before the agency decides what kind of environmental assessment is appropriate for a proposed project.

The Planning Department notified the following California Native American Tribes per the requirements of AB52:

- Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kızh Nation
- Soboba Band Luiseño Indians
- Torres Martinez Band of Cahuilla Indians.
- San Manuel Band of Mission Indians

The Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kızh Nation, Soboba Band Luiseño Indians, and the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians requested consultation and indicated that tribal cultural resources could be present on the site. As a result of the AB52 consultation process, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measure TCR-1- Native American Monitoring, Treatment of Discoveries, and Disposition of Discoveries.**

I. a. **TREATMENT PLAN:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a treatment plan in accordance with Part II (b) “Treatment of Discoveries” of this mitigation measure for the review and approval of the Planning Director.

   b. **ARCHEOLOGICAL MONITOR:** An archaeological monitor shall be present for all ground-disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area.

II. a. **MONITORING:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s). A copy of the agreement shall be provided to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

   b. **TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES:** If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). A representative of the appropriate Native American
Tribe(s), the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented to protect the identified tribal cultural resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the tribal cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered tribal cultural resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility, or, the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the City of Jurupa Valley. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.

c. DISPOSITION OF DISCOVERIES: In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:

The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to tribal cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the Jurupa Valley Planning Department with evidence of same:

1. A fully executed reburial agreement with the appropriate culturally affiliated Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.
2. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.
3. If more than one Native American Group is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default.
4. Should reburial of collected cultural items be preferred, it shall not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department. Should curation be preferred, the
developer/permit applicant is responsible for all costs and the repository and curation method shall be described in the Phase IV monitoring report.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1, impacts will be less than significant.
### Utilities and Service Systems

#### 3.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.17(a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Source: Rubidoux Community Services District.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*
Wastewater collection services would be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District ("District"). Pursuant to General Waste Discharge Requirements for Wastewater Collection Agencies (State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ) the District must demonstrate, through sanitary sewer system use ordinances, service agreements, or other legally binding procedures, that it possesses the necessary legal authority to prevent illicit discharges into its sanitary sewer system as set forth in the District's Sewer System Management Plan.

Wastewater generated by the Project will be collected and conveyed through wastewater conveyance facilities (trunk sewer, lift station, and force main) to the Riverside Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP), which is located on Acorn Street in the City of Riverside. The RWQCP is required to operate its treatment facility in accordance with the waste treatment and discharge standards and requirements set forth by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposed Project would not install or utilize septic systems or alternative wastewater treatment systems; therefore, the Project would have no potential to exceed the applicable wastewater treatment requirements established by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

3.17(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?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Rubidoux Community Services District, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

Water and sewer service to the Project site will be provided by the Rubidoux Community Services District. New water and sewer lines will connect to the existing facilities in 30th Street. No additional water or sewer infrastructure will be needed to serve the Project other than connection to the existing water and sewer lines in the immediate vicinity of the Project site.

The installation of water and sewer lines as proposed by the Project would result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of the Project site. These impacts are considered to be part of the Project’s construction phase and are evaluated throughout this Initial Study Checklist. In instances where impacts have not been identified for the Project’s construction phase, Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP), Project Design Features (PDF), or Mitigation Measures (MM) are required to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, additional measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study Checklist would not be required.
3.17(c)  **Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

Refer to PPP 3.9-1 through PPP 3.9-4 under Section 3.9-Hydrology and Water Quality.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

Refer to PDF 3.9-1 under Section 3.9-Hydrology and Water Quality.

Drainage will flow in Street A from north to south where it will be captured in the water quality basin at the southern end of the Project site. After first flush treatment, it will be discharged via a storm drain line that will connect to the storm drain line maintained by the Riverside County Flood Control District which borders the western boundary of the Project site.

The construction of the on-site and off-site drainage facilities would result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of the Project site. These impacts are part of the Project's construction phase and are evaluated in the appropriate sections of this Initial Study Checklist. In any instances where impacts have been identified for the Project's construction phase, Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP), Project Design Features (PDF), or Mitigation Measures are required to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, additional measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study Checklist would not be required.

3.17(d)  **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Rubidoux Community Services District.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is located within the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD). The JCSD Board of Directors approved a “no contest” action that supports the de-annexation of the Project site from
JCSD and the annexation of the Project site to the Rubidoux Community Services District. As such, water service will be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District ("District").

According to the District's Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the base daily water use is 208 gallons per day per capita (gpcd). According to the California Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018 Jurupa Valley has 3.35 persons per household. Thus, the Project would generate 114 residents. Based on the 208 gpcd, the Project would result in an estimated water demand of 23,712 gpcd.

According to the District's Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the sole source of potable water supply for the District and for all water users in the Rubidoux Community is groundwater extracted from the southern portion of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin 1 (also referred to herein as the Riverside Basin) of the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin. The Basin encompasses the District’s entire service area. The District expects that groundwater extracted from the Basin by six potable and six non-potable (irrigation only) groundwater wells will continue to be its primary (and possibly only) source of water through the year 2040, and possibly beyond.

The Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin is adjudicated, as set forth in Judgment No. 78426 (also referred to herein as the Basin Judgment). According to Section IX(b) of the Basin Judgment, entered April 17, 1969, "over any five-year period, there may be extracted from such Basin Area, without replenishment obligation, an amount equal to five times such annual average for the Basin Area; provided, however, that if extractions in any year exceed such average by more than 20 percent, Western [Western Municipal Water District] shall provide replenishment in the following year equal to the excess extractions over such 20 percent peaking allowance."

In August 2015, DWR released a draft list of 21 groundwater basins and subbasins significantly overdrafted by "excessive" pumping in response to a series of executive orders issued by Governor Brown since January 2014. The Riverside-Arlington Subbasin was not included in this list. DWR published the final list in January 2016, with no changes to the designation of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin.

The District does not have an immediate concern with water supply reliability. Because the District's water supply is groundwater, which has historically not been impacted by seasonal or year-to-year climatic change, the District is not subject to short-term water shortages resulting from temporary dry weather conditions. In the foreseeable future, the District will continue to be reliant on local groundwater supplies. The District will develop additional groundwater extraction and groundwater treatment facilities as needed to ensure a continuous and adequate water supply for its service area.

Based on the analysis above, impacts are less than significant.
3.17(e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Rubidoux Community Services District, CalEEMod.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is located within the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD). The JCSD Board of Directors approved a “no contest” action that supports the de-annexation of the Project site from JCSD and the annexation of the Project site to the Rubidoux Community Services District. As such, sewer service will be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District (“District”).

The District purchases treatment capacity at the Riverside Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP), which is located on Acom Street in the City of Riverside. The current capacity of the RWQCP is 40 million gallons per day (approximately 123 acre-feet per day). The District is currently in the early planning stages for construction of additions to the plant. Quantities of wastewater collected and conveyed by the District to the RWQCP in 2015 was 2,212 AF/yr. The quantities projected to be conveyed by District and treated by the City of Riverside over the next 25 years are: 2,290 AF/yr in 2020; 2,310 AF/yr in 2025; 2,320 AF/yr in 2030; 2,330 AF/yr in 2035; and 2,350 SF/yr in 2040.

Wastewater use for the Project was estimated by using The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The model can be used to estimate wastewater usage for analysis in CEQA documents. The Project is estimated to have an indoor water demand of 1.77 million gallons per year which includes wastewater. Assuming (a maximum) that all the water is discharged to the sewer system, the increase in wastewater from the proposed Project would be 5.79 AF (acre feet per year), which is within the operational capacity of the RWQCP. The capacity of existing wastewater treatment plant would be able to accommodate this increase within the existing capacity. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in impacts related to wastewater treatment provider capacity, and impacts would be less than significant.

3.17(f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Riverside County Waste Management, Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details, CalEEMod.

Impact Analysis
**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to landfill capacity. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.17-1 The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the *2013 California Green Building Code Standards*, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor’s documentation that confirms the volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

**Construction Related Impacts**

Waste generated during the construction phase of the Project would primarily consist of discarded materials from the construction of streets, common areas, infrastructure installation, and other project-related construction activities. Solid waste generated in Jurupa Valley is generally transported to the Agua Mansa Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility at 1830 Agua Mansa Road. From there, recyclable materials are transferred to third-party providers, and waste materials are transported to various landfills in Riverside County, including the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on June 2, 2018, these landfills receive well below their maximum permitted daily disposal volume and demolition and construction waste generated by the Project is not anticipated to cause these landfills to exceed their maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Furthermore, none of these regional landfill facilities are expected to reach their total maximum permitted disposal capacities during the Project’s construction period. As such, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept construction solid waste generated by the Project.

**Operational Related Impacts**

To determine the solid waste demand of the proposed Project, default values for single-family residential housing were taken from CalEEMod. Based on CalEEMod default estimates for the proposed Project’s land uses, the proposed Project would result in a solid waste generation of approximately 9.94 tons per year. Based on the current recycling requirements, which require diversion of 50 percent of solid waste away from landfills, the proposed Project’s solid waste generation would be reduced to 4.97 tons of solid waste per year. In 2020, state regulations per AB 341 will become effective, which will require diversion of 75 percent of solid waste from landfills. Thus, it is anticipated that solid waste landfill disposal from operation of the Project in 2020 would be further reduced to approximately 2.2 tons per year.
According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on June 2, 2018 the Badlands Sanitary Landfill has a permitted disposal capacity of 4,000 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 14,730,020 cubic yards. The Badlands Sanitary Landfill is estimated to reach capacity, at the earliest time, in the year 2024. The El Sobrante Landfill has a permitted disposal capacity of 16,034 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 145,530,000 tons. The El Sobrante Landfill is estimated to reach capacity, at the earliest time, in the year 2045.

Solid waste generated during long-term operation of the Project would ultimately be disposed of at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and/or the El Sobrante Landfill. During long-term operation, the Project’s solid waste (without the 50% and 75% reduction described above) would represent less than 0.003% of the daily permitted disposal capacity at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and less than 0.0009% of the daily permitted disposal capacity at the El Sobrante Landfill.

Because the Project would generate a relatively small amount of solid waste per day, as compared to the permitted daily capacities for Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept solid waste generated by the Project.

Based on the above analysis, impacts are less than significant.

**3.17(g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: California Assembly Bill 939 (Sher), Riverside County Waste Resources Management District, Riverside County Integrated Waste Management Plan, Riverside County Waste Management Department, Solid Waste System Study Report, Waste Management “El Sobrante Landfill”*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to solid waste. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:

PPP 3.17-1 The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the *2013 California Green Building Code Standards*, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor’s documentation that confirms the volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*
Construction Related Impacts

Waste generated during the construction phase of the Project would primarily consist of discarded materials from the construction of streets, common areas, infrastructure installation, and other project-related construction activities. According to the Riverside County Waste Management Department, solid waste generated within the City of Jurupa Valley is deposited at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on March 28, 2018, these landfills receive below their maximum permitted daily disposal volume and demolition and construction waste generated by the Project is not anticipated to cause these landfills to exceed their maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Furthermore, none of these regional landfill facilities are expected to reach their total maximum permitted disposal capacities during the Project’s construction period. As such, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept construction solid waste generated by the Project.

Operational Related Impacts

The California Integrated Waste Management Act established an integrated waste management system that focused on source reduction, recycling, composting, and land disposal of waste. In addition, the Act established a 50% waste reduction requirement for cities and counties by the year 2000, along with a process to ensure environmentally safe disposal of waste that could not be diverted. Per the requirements of the Integrated Waste Management Act, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors adopted the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan which outlines the goals, policies, and programs the County and its cities will implement to create an integrated and cost effective waste management system that complies with the provisions of California Integrated Waste Management Act and its diversion mandates.

The Project’s waste hauler would be required to coordinate with the waste hauler to develop collection of recyclable materials for the Project on a common schedule as set forth in applicable local, regional, and State programs. Recyclable materials that would be recycled by the Project include paper products, glass, aluminum, and plastic.

Additionally, the Project’s waste hauler would be required to comply with all applicable local, State, and Federal solid waste disposal standards, thereby ensuring that the solid waste stream to the landfills that serve the Project are reduced in accordance with existing regulations.

Based on the analysis above, impacts are less than significant.
3.19 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the Project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Source: This Initial Study Checklist.

Impact Analysis

As noted in the analysis throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:
Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

All Plans, Policies, or Programs pertaining to Biological Resources and Cultural Resources shall apply.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Mitigation Measure(s)

BIO-1 through BIO-5, CR-1 through CR-4, and TCR-1 shall apply.

In instances where impacts have been identified, the Plans, Policies, or Programs were applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduces environmental impacts, or Mitigation Measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, Project does not have impacts which would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

3.19(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)?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**

*Source: This Initial Study Checklist.*

**Impact Analysis**

As noted in the analysis throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

All Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) identified in this Initial Study Checklist document shall apply.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Mitigation Measures (MM)

BIO-1 through BIO-5, CR-1 through CR-4, NOI-1, and TCR-1 shall apply.
In instances where impacts have been identified, the Plans, Policies, or Programs were applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduces environmental impacts, or Mitigation Measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, Project does not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

3.19(c) Does the Project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: This Initial Study Checklist.*

**Impact Analysis**

As noted in the analysis throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**


**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

NOI-1 shall apply.

In instances where impacts have been identified, the Plans, Policies, or Programs were applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduces environmental impacts. Therefore, Project does not have impacts which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
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6.0 MITIGATION MONITORING REPORTING PROGRAM

PROJECT NAME: Change of Zone No. 18001, Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 with exception, and Variance No. 18004

DATE: November 12, 2018

PROJECT MANAGER: Annette Tam, Senior Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

- **Change of Zone (CZ) No. 18001**: Amend the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One Family Dwelling).

- **Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37470**: Subdivide 6.76 acres of land into 34 single-family residential lots with a minimum lot size of 5,711 square feet. The exception application to allow several lots out of 34 lots to have lot depth greater than 2 ½ times than the lot width.

- **Variance (VAR) No. 18004**: The Variance application is to request the change of minimum lot area from 7,200 square-feet to 5,711 square-feet and the minimum average frontage of lot from 60 feet to 50 feet.

PROJECT LOCATION: The Project is located on the south side of intersection of Sierra Avenue & 30th Street. The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 177-020-012, 177-020-018, and 177-110-005.

Throughout this Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, reference is made to the following:

- **Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) –** These include existing regulatory requirements such as plans, policies, or programs applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduce environmental impacts.

- **Project Design Features (PDF) –** These measures include features proposed by the Project that are already incorporated into the Project’s design and are specifically intended to reduce or avoid impacts (e.g., water quality treatment basins).

- **Mitigation Measures (MM) –** These measures include requirements that are imposed where the impact analysis determines that implementation of the proposed Project would result in significant impacts; mitigation measures are proposed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA.
Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) and Project Design Features (PDF) were assumed and accounted for in the assessment of impacts for each issue area. Mitigation Measures were formulated only for those issue areas where the results of the impact analysis identified significant impacts. All three types of measures described above will be required to be implemented as part of the Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETICS</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.1-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 9.55.020(1) (1) building height shall not exceed three (3) stories, with a maximum height of forty (40) feet.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.1-2 As required by General Plan Policy COS 10.1, require outdoor lighting to be shielded and prohibit outdoor lighting that: 1. Operates at unnecessary locations, levels, and times. 2. Spills onto areas off-site or to areas not needing or wanting illumination. 3. Produces glare (intense line-of-site contrast). 4. Includes lighting frequencies (colors) that interfere with astronomical viewing.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a building permit and during project operation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PPP 3.3-1 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, “Fugitive Dust.” Rule 403 requires implementation of best available dust control measures during construction activities that generate fugitive dust, such as earth moving and stockpiling activities, grading, and equipment travel on unpaved roads. Measures listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any grading permits:  
  - “All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 25 mph per SCAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust emissions.”  
  - “The contractor shall ensure that all disturbed unpaved roads and disturbed areas within the Project are watered at least three (3) times daily during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after | Engineering Department | Notes must be on the grading plan prior to the issuance of the grading permit and the project is required to comply with the provisions of “Fugitive Dust” during grading |             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| work is done for the day.”  
- “The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.” | Building & Safety Department | During construction | |
| **PPP 3.3-2** The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 “PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations” and Rule 1186.1, “Less-Polluting Street Sweepers.” Adherence to Rules 1186 and 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction. | Building & Safety Department | During construction | Notes must be on the plans and documents; the project shall comply with the provisions of “Architectural Coatings” during construction and on-going |
| **PPP 3.3-3** The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113; “Architectural Coatings” Rule 1113 limits the release of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) into the atmosphere during painting and application of other surface coatings. The measure listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any building permits:  
- “In order to limit the VOC content of architectural coatings used in the SCAB, architectural coatings shall be no more than a low VOC default level of 50 g/L unless otherwise specified in the SCAQMD Table of Standards (pg. 32-33).” | Building & Safety Department  
Engineering Department  
Planning Department | During construction | On-going |
| **PPP 3.3-4** The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 “PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations” and Rule 1186.1, “Less-Polluting Street Sweepers.” Adherence to Rule 1186 and Rule 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction. | Building & Safety Department | During construction | |
| **PPP 3.3-5** The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 “Nuisance.” Adherence to Rule 402 reduces the release of odorous emissions into the atmosphere. | Planning Department | On-going | |
### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.4-1</strong></td>
<td>The Project is required to pay mitigation fees pursuant to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MHSCP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM-BIO-1: July 2019 Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Survey</strong></td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Survey shall be conducted pursuant to the Interim General Survey Guidelines for the Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, December 30, 1996) and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department. In order to issue a grading permit, the results of the survey must be negative for the presence of the species. In the event, the species is present, the Applicant shall be required to maintain the MSHCP in rough step. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, the funding or purchase of suitable DSF habitat, purchasing conservation credits from an existing DSF mitigation bank, and/or acquiring and funding of habitat restoration.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **MM-BIO-2: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey** | Within 30 calendar days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of the Project’s proposed impact footprint and make a determination regarding the presence or absence of the burrowing owl. The determination shall be documented in a report and shall be submitted, reviewed, and accepted by the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit and subject to the following provisions:  

   a. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies no burrowing owls in the impact area, a grading permit may be issued without restriction.  
   
   b. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies the presence of burrowing owl, then prior to the issuance of a grading permit and prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities on the property, the qualified biologist shall follow the methods recommended by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW, 2012) and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP, 2006) for passive or active relocation of burrowing owls. Passive relocation, including the required use of one-way doors to exclude owls from the site and the collapsing of burrows, will occur if the biologist determines that the proximity and availability of alternate habitat is suitable for successful passive relocation. Passive relocation shall follow | Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit |
California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. If proximate alternate habitat is not present as determined by the biologist, active relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. The biologist shall provide evidence in writing to the Planning Department that the species has fledged or been relocated prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

**MM BIO-3. Coordination With Regulatory Agencies.** Prior to the issuance of grading permit, the Project Applicant shall contact the United State Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to positively determine whether or not either agency wishes to exert jurisdiction of the onsite drainage features. If either agency decides to exert jurisdiction, Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5 shall be implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BIO-4. Federal Jurisdiction.</strong></th>
<th><strong>BIO-5. CDFW Jurisdiction.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If federal jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-3, the following shall be implemented: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 Nation-Wide Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) and compensate for the loss of 746 linear feet of streambed totaling 0.02 acre at a ratio of not less than 3:1 onsite or not less than 2:1 for permanent impacts, and a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). These permits will address impacts to identified jurisdictional resources on the Project site and appropriate offsite mitigation such as such as the Santa Ana Watershed Project Area (SAWPA), Prado Basin, or an appropriate nearby downstream established mitigation bank area. The developer shall implement this measure to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department. No USACE mitigation will be required and this mitigation measure may be waived for the proposed Project, if the applicant provides written evidence to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department that the USACE will rely upon the Highland Park (TM 31893) Approved Jurisdictional Determination. The adjacent project also has a waste discharge order, dated May 1, 2017 (Adoption of Order No. RS-2017-0020). The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) will likely issue a waste discharge order for the proposed project, if the USACE makes a non-jurisdictional determination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

M-5
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The following shall be incorporated into the permitting, subject to approval by the regulatory agencies: (a) Replacement and/or restoration of jurisdictional “waters of the State” within the Santa Ana River watershed for 746 linear feet of streambed totaling 0.02 acre at a ratio of not less than 3:1 onsite or not less than 2:1 for permanent impacts; (b) The applicant shall restore any onsite or offsite temporary impact areas to pre-project conditions and revegetate where applicable; and (c) Off-site mitigation may occur on land acquired for the purpose of in-perpetuity preservation, or through the purchase of mitigation credits at an agency approved off-site mitigation bank or within an agency-accepted off-site permittee responsible mitigation area such as the Santa Ana Watershed Project Area (SAWPA), Prado Basin, or an appropriate nearby downstream established mitigation bank area.

No CDFW mitigation will be required and this mitigation measure may be waived for the proposed Project, if the applicant provides written evidence to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department that if the CDFW does not respond to the streambed alteration notification, then the proposed Project can proceed 60 days after the CDFW states the application is complete or after receiving a CDFW Operation of Law letter.

**CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**MM- CR-1: Archaeological Monitoring.** A qualified archaeologist (the “Project Archaeologist”) shall be retained by the Project Applicant prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Archaeologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential cultural resources by project personnel. If archaeological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Archaeologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-2 shall apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of grading permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**MM- CR-2: Archeological Treatment Plan.** If a significant archaeological resource(s) is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). The archaeological monitor, the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented by the archaeologist to protect the identified archaeological resource(s) from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data collection plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Department</th>
<th>During grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
A recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the archaeological resource(s) in accordance with current professional archaeology standards (typically this sampling level is two (2) to five (5) percent of the volume of the cultural deposit). At the completion of the laboratory analysis, any recovered archaeological resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department and the Eastern Information Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM-CR-3: Paleontological Monitoring</th>
<th>Engineering Department</th>
<th>During grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A qualified paleontologist (the “Project Paleontologist”) shall be retained by the Project Applicant prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Paleontologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential paleontological resources by project personnel. If paleontological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Paleontologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-4 shall apply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM-CR-4: Paleontological Treatment Plan</th>
<th>Planning Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit or as otherwise determined by the Planning Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a significant paleontological resource(s) is discovered on the property, in consultation with the Project proponent and the City, the qualified paleontologist shall develop a plan of mitigation which shall include salvage excavation and removal of the find, removal of sediment from around the specimen (in the laboratory), research to identify and categorize the find, curation in a local qualified repository, and preparation of a report summarizing the find.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPP 3.5-1</th>
<th>Planning Department</th>
<th>During grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project is required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.6-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the <em>California Building Code</em> to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP’s 3.91-1 through PPP 3.9-4 in Section 3.9, <em>Hydrology and Water Quality</em> shall apply.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.7-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, <em>California Energy Code</em>, prior to issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall submit plans showing that the Project will be constructed in compliance with the most recently adopted edition of the applicable California Building Code Title 24 requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.7-2 As required by Municipal Code Section 9.283.010, <em>Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements</em>, prior to the approval of landscaping and irrigation plans, the Project Applicant shall prepare and submit landscape and irrigation plans that demonstrate compliance with this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.7-3 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010 (8), the Project proponent shall comply with the <em>California Green Building Standards</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.8-1 As required by <em>General Plan Policy CSSF 1.31-Federal/State Laws</em>. Comply with federal and state laws regarding the management of hazardous waste and materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.9-1</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, <em>Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (1)</em>, any person performing construction work in the city shall comply with the provisions of this chapter, and shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.9-2</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, <em>Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (2)</em>, any person performing construction work in the city shall be regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board in a manner pursuant to and consistent with applicable requirements contained in the General Permit No. CAS000002, State Water Resources Control Board Order Number 2009-0009-DWQ. The city may notify the State Board of any person performing construction work that has a non-compliant construction site per the General Permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.9-3</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, <em>Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section C</em>, new development or redevelopment projects shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any deterioration of water quality that would impair subsequent or competing uses of the water. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer. The BMPs may include, but are not limited to, the following and may, among other things, require new developments or redevelopments to do any of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Increase permeable areas by leaving highly porous soil and low lying area undisturbed by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Incorporating landscaping, green roofs and open space into the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) Using porous materials for or near driveways, drive aisles, parking stalls and low volume roads and walkways; and

c) Incorporating detention ponds and infiltration pits into the project design.

(2) Direct runoff to permeable areas by orienting it away from impermeable areas to swales, berms, green strip filters, gravel beds, rain gardens, pervious pavement or other approved green infrastructure and French drains by:

(a) Installing rain-gutters oriented towards permeable areas;

(b) Modifying the grade of the property to divert flow to permeable areas and minimize the amount of storm water runoff leaving the property; and

(c) Designing curbs, berms or other structures such that they do not isolate permeable or landscaped areas.

(3) Maximize storm water storage for reuse by using retention structures, subsurface areas, cisterns, or other structures to store storm water runoff for reuse or slow release.

(4) Rain gardens may be proposed in-lieu of a water quality basin when applicable and approved by the City Engineer.

PPP 3.9-4 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section E, any person or entity that owns or operates a commercial and/or industrial facility(s) shall comply with the provisions of this chapter. All such facilities shall be subject to a regular program of inspection as required by this chapter, any NPDES permit issued by the State Water Resource Control Board, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Wat. Code Section 13000 et seq.), Title 33 U.S.C. Section 1251 et seq. (Clean Water Act), any applicable state or federal regulations promulgated thereto, and any related administrative orders or permits issued in connection therewith.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NOISE</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.12-1</strong> As required by Municipal Code Section 11.05.020 (9), private construction projects located within one-quarter (¼) of a mile from an inhabited dwelling shall not perform construction between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and six (6:00) a.m. during the months of June through September and between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and seven (7:00) a.m. during the months of October through May.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.12-2</strong> As required by Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 11.05.040, no person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1 of this section or that violates the special sound source standards set forth in Section 11.05.060.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure NOI-1-Construction Noise Mitigation Plan.</strong> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant is required to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the City Planning Department for review and approval. The plan must depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project. In addition, the plan shall require that the following notes are included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by City of Jurupa Valley staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Haul truck deliveries shall be limited to between the hours of 6:00am to 6:00pm during the months of June through September and 7:00am to 6:00pm during the months of October through May.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers’ standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) All stationary construction equipment shall be placed in such a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from any sensitive receptors adjacent to the Project site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Construction equipment staging areas shall be located the greatest distance between the staging area and the nearest sensitive receptors.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.14-1</strong> The Project Applicant shall comply with all applicable Riverside County Fire Department codes, ordinances, and standard conditions regarding fire prevention and suppression measures relating to water improvement plans, fire hydrants, automatic fire extinguishing systems, fire access, access gates, combustible construction, water availability, and fire sprinkler systems.</td>
<td>Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.14-2</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 et seq., the Project proponent shall pay a Development Impact Fee (DIF) following protocol for impact fee collection.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.14-3</strong> As required by Section 65995 of the Government Code, the Project Applicant shall pay required development impact fees to the applicable school district following protocol for impact fee collection required by that district.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.14-4</strong> Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.16-1</strong> Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Proponent shall make required per-unit fee payments associated with the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF), and the City of Jurupa Valley Development Impact Fee (DIF) per Title 3 of the Municipal Code.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>TUMF shall be paid in accordance to the deadline stated in Chapter 3.70 DIF shall be paid in accordance to the deadline stated in Chapter 3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.16-2</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, the Project is required to pay a Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing revenue that the City can use to fund transportation improvements such as roads, bridges, major improvements and traffic signals.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>DIF shall be paid in accordance to the deadline stated in Chapter 3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planning Department &amp; Engineering Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>TREATMENT PLAN:</strong> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a treatment plan in accordance with Part II (b) “Treatment of Discoveries” of this mitigation measure for the review and approval of the Planning Director.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITOR:</strong> An archaeological monitor shall be present for all ground-disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>MONITORING:</strong> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s). A copy of the agreement shall be provided to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES:</strong> If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). A representative of the appropriate Native American Tribe(s), the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented to protect the identified tribal cultural resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the tribal cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered tribal cultural resources shall be processed and curated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility, or, the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the City of Jurupa Valley. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.

c. **DISPOSITION OF DISCOVERIES:** In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries: The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to tribal cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the Jurupa Valley Planning Department with evidence of same:

1. A fully executed reburial agreement with the appropriate culturally affiliated Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.

2. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.

3. If more than one Native American Group is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default.
4. Should reburial of collected cultural items be preferred, it shall not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department. Should curation be preferred, the developer/permit applicant is responsible for all costs and the repository and curation method shall be described in the Phase IV monitoring report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.17-1 The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the 2013 California Green Building Code Standards, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor’s documentation that confirms the volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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